DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 878 AL 002 285

TITLE	SOUTHEAST ASIAN MINISTERS OF EDUCATION ORGANISATION FIFTH MEETING OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE (SINGAPORE). REPORT.
INSTITUTION	REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE, SINGAPORE.
SPONS AGENCY	GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE.
REPORT NO	SEAMES-P6-CC5
PUB DATE	MAR 69
NOTE	154P.; REPORT OF THE FIFTH SEAMEO MEETING CONVENED BY THE REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE AND THE PHILIPPINES DEPT. OF EDUCATION, QUEZON CITY, PHILIPPINES, MAR. 4-6, 1969
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$7.80
DESCRIPTORS	AREA STUDIES, *EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, *ENGLISH (SECOND LANGUAGE), INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS, *LANGUAGE TEACHERS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *TEACHER SEMINARS
IDENTIFIERS	PHILIPPINES

ABSTRACT

THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE COORDINATING COMMITTEE HELD IN QUEZON CITY, PHILIPPINES IN MARCH 1969 WAS ATTENDED BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS FROM INDONESIA, LAOS, MALAYSIA, THE PHILIPPINES, SINGAPORE, AND THAILAND. S. THAVISAKDI, SEAMES DIRECTOR, WAS PRESENT, AS WERE CONSULTANTS FROM THAILAND, THE RELC STAFF, AND OBSERVERS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES, THE BUREAU OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS, THE BUREAU OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF ATENEO DE MANILA, THE UNIVERSITY OF STO. TOMAS, THE PHILIPPINE NORMAL COLLEGE, THE UNIVERSITY OF THE EAST, THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PHILIPPINES, AND THE PHILIPPINE UNION COLLEGE. THE COMMITTEE DELIBERATED ON THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE SEAMEC CONFERENCE IN DJAKARTA IN JANUARY 1969, TRAINING PROGRAMS, RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REGIONAL SEMINAR ON THE TRYOUT OF TEP ("TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM," PRODUCED BY WASHINGTON EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES/ENGLISH LANGUAGE SERVICES), THE DRAFT RELC CONSTITUTION, THE RELC JOURNAL, AND OTHER RELC PLANS. DISCUSSIONS OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES AND PROPOSALS, ADDRESSES DELIVERED, THE PROGRAM SCHEDULES, AND LISTS OF PARTICIPANTS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS ARE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT. (SEE ED 033 351 AND ED 003 352 FOR DESCRIPTIONS OF EARLIER CONVENTIONS AND THE ESTABLISHING OF RELC.) (AMM)

SEAMES/P6/CC5

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOUTHEAST ASIAN MINISTERS OF EDUCATION ORGANISATION

ED035878

FIFTH MEETING OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR THE REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE

(Singapore)

Convened by the
Regional English Language Centre
with the co-operation of the
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Philippines

AL 002 285

REPORT

QUEZON CITY, PHILIPPINES

4th – 6th March, 1969

ED035878

SOUTHEAST ASIAN MINISTERS OF EDUCATION ORGANISATION

FIFTH MEETING OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE
FOR THE
REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE
(Singapore)

Convened by the

Regional English Language Centre

with the co-operation of the

Department of Education

Philippines

REPORT

Quezon City, Philippines

4th - 6th March, 1969

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Part I

1. Report by the Chairman, Coordinating Committee 4

2. Highlights of the report by the Chairman of the Coordinating Committee 14

3. Resolutions passed at the SEAMEC Conference in January, 1969 17

4. Training programmes 18

    4.1 Evaluation of the first 4-month training course, September - December, 1968

    4.2 Second 4-month training course, February - May, 1969

    4.3 Post-training utilisation and follow-up activities of RELC course members

    4.4 Certificates and distinctions

    4.5 Fee-paying course members and research scholars

5. National Committees to liaise with RELC on professional matters 27

6. Recommendations of the Regional Seminar on TEP Tryout at the RELC, October - November, 1968 28

7. Evaluation of the RELC programmes 32

8. RELC Constitution 37

Page

9. SEAMES plan for Special Funds 39

10. RELC budget estimates for the year July 1969 - June 1970 41

11. Regional Seminar on New Developments in the Theory and Methods of Teaching and Learning English, June 1969 ... 42

12. RELC activities for the second year of the interim operational programme 44

    12.1 Discussion on RELC activities

    12.2 Regional meetings and seminars 1969 - 70

13. RELC Bulletin 47

14. Date and place of next meeting 48

Part II

A Appendices

1. Agenda 49

2. Some of the resolutions passed at the Fourth SEAMEC Conference, Djakarta, 7 - 10 January, 1969 51

3. Evaluation of the first 4-month training course, September - December, 1968 56

4. Post-training utilisation and follow-up activities of RELC course members 69

5. Fee-paying course members and research scholar status 75

6. National Committee Members to liaise with RELC Librarian and Head of Information Centre and Specialists in Research Design and Instructional Materials 78

Page

7. Progress on TEP Development and Recommendations on further RELC Research on TEP 81

8. Some observations on evaluation at the Regional English Language Centre 87

9. Draft Constitution of the Regional English Language Centre 98

10. From "RELC Data submission to SEAMES for developing strategy and plans for fund-raising activities" October 1968 104

11. Regional English Language Centre estimated operational budget for the year July 1969 - June 1970 107

12. Provisional arrangements for the Fourth Regional Seminar of the SEAMEC Regional English Language Centre 110

13. RELC interim operational programme, proposed year II activities, 1 July 1969 - 30 June 1970 113

14. Provisional dates of some RELC events in 1969 - 1970 117

15. RELC Bulletin 118

B. Annexes

1. Speech delivered by the Hon. Juan L. Manuel, Director of Public Schools, Philippines 123

2. Address delivered by Mr. Thavisakdi Srimuang, SEAMES Representative 127

3. Closing remarks by Mrs. Tai Yu-lin, Chairman of the Coordinating Committee 131

Page

4. Time-table 133

5. List of Participants 135

6. Organising Committee 139

7. Communique 141

INTRODUCTION

The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council, composed of the Ministers of Education of the seven member countries - Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam set up a Coordinating Committee comprising representatives from the SEAMEC member countries to formulate the plans for the establishment of the Regional English Language Centre (RELC).

The First Meeting of the Coordinating Committee in Singapore in June 1967 recommended the establishment of an Interim Project Office to prepare for the operational year of the RELC beginning on 1 July 1968.

The Second Meeting of the Coordinating Committee held in Kuala Lumpur in October 1967 reaffirmed the purpose of the Centre to support and promote regional cooperation in improving English teaching in the SEAMEC countries.

At its Third Conference in Singapore 1-3 April 1968 the Coordinating Committee discussed the proposed four-month training courses to be held at the Centre and approved job descriptions of the administrative and professional staff of the interim Centre.

The Fourth Meeting held in Malang, 30 September - 2 October 1968, discussed, among others, matters arising out of Centre activities, sketch plans of the permanent RELC, priorities of RELC activities under special fund arrangement, and inter-project relations.

The Fifth Meeting of the Regional English Language Centre Coordinating Committee held in Quezon City, Philippines, 4-6 March, 1969, was attended by the Committee Members from Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Mr. Srimuang Thavisakdi, representing the Director of SEAMES, was present at the meeting. Also present were consultants from Thailand, the RELC Staff, and observers from the University of the Philippines, the Bureau of Public Schools, the Bureau of Vocational Education, University of Ateneo de Manila, University of Sto. Tomas, the Philippine Normal College, University of the East, Catholic Educational Association of the Philippines, and the Philippine Union College. At the opening ceremony, the Under-Secretary of Education of the Philippines, Mr. Juan Manuel, welcomed the participants, observers and guests.

During the three-day meeting, the Coordinating Committee deliberated on the resolutions passed at the SEAMEC Conference in Djakarta, January 1969, training programmes, recommendations of the Regional Seminar on TEP tryout at the RELC, the draft RELC Constitution, the RELC Journal, the seminar planned for June 1969, SEAMES plan for Special Funds and evaluation procedures for the RELC programmes.

This document is a report of the Fifth Coordinating Committee Meeting.

Part I consists of the Chairman's report, discussion summaries and recommendations made.

Part II presents the Appendices and Annexes. The Appendices consist of the agenda and documents used at the meeting. The Annexes contain the texts of speeches delivered at the opening ceremony by the Honourable Mr. Juan L. Manuel and Mr. Srimuang Thavisakdi, the closing address by the Chairman, lists of the participants, observers and members of the organising committee, and the communique.

1. REPORT BY THE CHAIRMAN, COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Distinguished Members of the Coordinating Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In my capacity as Chairman of the Coordinating Committee, I would like to present to you a brief account of the activities of the RELC since our Fourth Meeting held in Malang between 30th September and 2nd October 1968, exactly five months ago.

The first 4-month training course which commenced on 2nd September 1968 was concluded on 28th December 1968. This course represented an important milestone in the history of the development of the RELC. The first 4-month intensive course constituted the opening stage of the Centre's training programme. Within the general guidelines laid down by the Coordinating Committee, the Centre had attempted to make the content of the course considerably varied in order to meet individual needs. The 400-hour intensive course offered basic studies in such fields as Phonetics, Linguistics, Language Teaching Methodology, English Structure, Syllabuses and Textbooks, the Preparation of Instructional Materials, and the Use of Audio-Visual Aids in Language Teaching. In addition, elective subjects were offered in more specialised fields such as Programmed Instruction, Literature and the Language Programme, Language Laboratory Utilisation, the Psychology of Second Language Learning and the Theory and

Practice of Testing. Optional subjects in Remedial English and a condensed version of the Teacher Education Program were also offered. There was also considerable practical work done in the actual preparation of instructional materials and in the construction of visual aids with inexpensive and locally-available materials. Observatory visits to language classes in a number of Singapore schools were arranged. 34 films on language teaching and allied subjects were shown. In addition, there were weekly seminars, discussions and tutorials on different topics. A quarter of the total course time, that is to say - 100 hours - was devoted to supervised work on an individually-chosen project or study. The topics of these projects were chosen by each course member with a view to his attempting to tackle, perhaps even beginning to solve, some of the problems in English language teaching specific to his country, institution or field of responsibility. Copies were made of these special assignments for the course members, their respective institutions and Ministry archives, as well as the RELC library. We hope that over the years these assignments will come to form a unique and ever-increasing body of materials of special value to persons concerned with English teaching in Southeast Asia.

On 28th December 1968 at 3 p.m. a Certificate Awarding Ceremony was held at the Singapore Conference Hall. The occasion was honoured and made auspicious by the presence of H. E. Mr. Ong Pang Boon, Singapore's Minister for Education and SEAMEC President (1968/9).

Seventeen course members from six SEAMEC countries received from H. E. Mr. Ong Pang Boon Certificates in the Teaching of English as a Second/Foreign Language after successfully completing the training course.

The second 4-month training course commenced on 3rd February this year as scheduled. 21 course members were nominated by six SEAMEC countries, namely Indonesia (4), Malaysia (4), the Philippines (4), Singapore (3), Thailand (3) and Vietnam (3).

Acting in response to the established rationale of the Centre, the Centre has, even at this early stage, designed special evaluation procedures for our training programmes, with a view to finding out how far the type of training offered meets the needs of member countries. The RELC Director and her professional staff have given much attention to this during the past six months. At this meeting you will hear a report from Dr. Donald Horst, RELC Research Design Specialist, on the evaluation of the first 4-month course. Also, the Centre is fortunate to have obtained the service of Dr. Robert Krug, Consultant from the American Institutes for Research and an expert in evaluation, who will personally be here to present a paper on Evaluation at the RELC for your deliberation during this meeting.

During the break between the first and second training courses in January 1969, three professional members of the Centre staff made brief survey visits to three SEAMEC countries to meet and talk to institution heads, to offer whatever consultant service they could and to obtain first-hand information about English teaching in these countries. Mr. Raymond Tongue, Specialist in Methodology, visited the Philippines; Mr. Alan Moller, Specialist in Instructional Materials, visited West Malaysia and Thailand; Dr. Donald Topping, Specialist in Linguistics, visited Sarawak. I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep gratitude to the Coordinating Committee members concerned for arranging very comprehensive and useful programmes for the three RELC staff members and the very warm hospitality extended to them during their survey tours. My grateful thanks are also due to the education authorities of all these three countries who took a personal interest in the visits and found time to meet the RELC staff in person. The RELC staff have found such visits most stimulating and extremely profitable.

The third and final phase of the TEP tryout at the RELC was completed in November 1968. It was indeed gratifying that all seven SEAMEC countries gave active support and were represented in the 10-month tryout between February and November 1968. A regional seminar on the tryout was held at the RELC from 31st October to 2nd November to discuss the results of the tryout and to make recommendations on the utilization of TEP. The Report of this seminar has been distributed to you. Dr. Donald Horst, who was supervisor of the entire tryout, will present to you his paper on the TEP Seminar recommendations.

I am pleased to inform my distinguished colleagues that at this stage of the RELC development, the Centre is quickly developing an effective Library and Information Centre service. The collection of major publications on linguistics and English teaching is growing steadily and rapidly with the assistance of governments and publishers. The Centre has established professional contacts with English teaching associations, organisations and institutions in many parts of the world. These contacts have proved to be mutually beneficial. They have allowed the sharing of information and experiences. They have also made possible the very useful exchange of publications that has contributed towards the building up of the library collection. Relevant publications are also received every day from linguistic societies and circles.

The Library is also building up its section of instructional materials produced specifically for the teaching of English as a second or foreign language both in the SEAMEC countries and in other parts of the world. A detailed survey of instructional materials in use in SEAMEC countries is being planned.

The Centre has enjoyed much success in the area of public relations. In the second issue of the RELC Newsletter we mentioned the detailed coverage of the Centre's activities given generously by the radio, press and television in Singapore. TESL centres overseas have also been generous in their response to the Centre's request for incorporating news about the RELC in their publications. Visitors continue to be numerous and often they include high-ranking government officials and distinguished scholars in the field of language education from various parts of the world.

A new brochure was published in January this year. This brochure describes the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation, the interim and permanent RELC facilities, the RELC objectives, the RELC milestones, and the funding scheme of the permanent RELC. This brochure was first distributed at the Fourth SEAMEC Conference in Djakarta, January this year.

My distinguished colleagues will be pleased to know that at the Fourth SEAMEC Conference, the policy recommendations made by this Committee during the third and fourth meetings in 1968 were approved by our Ministers of Education. The major resolutions passed at the Conference that concern the RELC have been extracted from the Conference Report for the information of members at this meeting. Our members may have been informed that on Indonesia's acceptance of the SEAMEO Charter, the fifth instrument of acceptance was received by SEAMES and the Charter of the Organisation had come into force. SEAMEO now possesses full juridical personality. While touching on legal matters, I would also like to inform members that in accordance with a SEAMEC resolution passed at the Third

Conference, the draft Constitution of the RELC underwent the scrutiny of the Solicitor-General of the Singapore Government. The earlier draft has been refined and the amended version will be studied during this meeting.

On the staff side, it is to be reported that in November 1968 the RELC approached the Government of U.K. for the provision of an AVA Specialist through the Singapore Ministry of Education as from July 1969. Since then the Centre's request with the support of the Singapore Ministry of Education has been given favourable consideration by U.K. It is expected that the AVA specialist will give attention to equipping the specialised AVA Department in the permanent RELC in addition to other assignments as soon as he arrives.

The RELC interim operational activities have been carried out with the unreserved cooperation and whole-hearted support from several sources. Up to the present, the support profile of the current financial year July 1968-June 1969 is as follows:

	US$ or US$ equivalent input	
US Government	147,000.00	1/
	10,000.00	2/
	11,760.00	3/
Government of Singapore	45,000.00	4/
Government of UK through the Government of Singapore	40,400.00	5/
Other Governments	1,430.00	6/

1/ Figure does not include cost of two professional staff members assigned to the Centre.

2/ Sum put aside for instructional materials ordered direct by USAID from US sources.

3/ Supplement of US$11,760 beyond the original US$32,000 estimate for training scholarships due to increased costs resulting from necessary change in housing and food arrangements for trainees.

4/ Dollar equivalent input by the Singapore Government in forms of physical plant, furnishings, maintenance of building and grounds, salaries, housing and utilities.

5/ Dollar equivalent input in forms of personnel, language laboratory, AV equipment and library items.

6/ Dollar equivalent input in forms of library items and works of art for decorating the interim Centre.

The 10-month TEP tryout at the RELC was given substantial support from the beginning by the United States Government through the American Institutes for Research contract services and all the SEAMEC countries. The dollar equivalent input for the TEP tryout is separately treated and is not included in the above table.

At the Second Meeting of the SEAMEC Project Directors/High Officials in Bangkok, June 1968, a USG representative announced that his

Government expected to reduce the funding of interim operational cost beyond June 1969 to no more than 50% of the total cost. During this meeting, an estimated RELC budget and support profile for the year July 1969 - June 1970 will be presented.

In accordance with a recommendation made at our Fourth Coordinating Committee Meeting, the RELC wrote to the member countries to request the setting up of National Committees along the lines agreed on in order to implement the developmental activities in areas of instructional materials, research and publications. It is hoped that at this meeting the names of the National Committee members and their respective areas of responsibility will be finalised.

The regional seminar to be held in June this year is at an advanced stage of planning. Invitations have been sent out to the SEAMEC Ministries of Education, and to possible guest speakers from within and outside the SEAMEC region. I would like to take this opportunity to once more express my warmest thanks to H.E. Inche Mohammed Khir Johari, Malaysia's Minister of Education, for graciously agreeing to host the seminar in Kuala Lumpur. A Seminar Planning Committee has been set up at the RELC. The provisional programme has been drawn up and will be presented at this meeting for your information. We are expecting a number of distinguished scholars in English teaching to present papers at the Seminar. There will be a good amount of new thinking stimulated. I venture to believe that we can all look forward to a successful seminar.

Finally, I would like to inform our distinguished colleagues that the RELC has received a number of requests from non-SEAMEC governments and universities to extend to them RELC training and research facilities. It is expected that at this meeting certain guidelines within the framework of resolutions passed by SEAMEC will be recommended by the Coordinating Committee in order that the RELC may act accordingly.

Thank you.

2. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN, COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Highlights

The Fifth Coordinating Committee Meeting started with the report of the Chairman who presided on the first day. The following important points in the report were noted:

a) The first 4-month training course at the RELC which commenced on 2nd September 1968 concluded on 28th December 1968. Certificates in the Teaching of English as a Second/Foreign Language were awarded to 17 course members from 6 SEAMEC countries who had successfully completed the training.

b) The second 4-month training course in TESL/TEFL commenced on 3rd February 1969 as scheduled. Eighteen course members from 5 SEAMEC countries are now attending the course.

c) The 10-month tryout of the Teacher Education Program with optimum regional participation was completed in November 1968. A regional seminar on the tryout was held from 31st October to 2nd November to discuss the results of the tryout and to make recommendations on the utilisation of the TEP materials.

d) The policy recommendations made by the Committee during the third and fourth Meetings in 1968 were approved by SEAMEC at the Fourth Ministerial Conference in January 1969.

e) With the receipt of the fifth instrument of acceptance by SEAMES, the Charter of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation has come into force. The Organisation now possesses full juridical personality.

After the report, the member from the Philippines, supporting the sentiment expressed by the Chairman, suggested a resolution expressing appreciation of the service of Dr. Dao Thi Hoi, former Rapporteur of the Committee, now residing in the United States. The following resolution was adopted:

> That the Coordinating Committee records its great appreciation of the valuable services as member and Rapporteur which Dr. Dao Thi Hoi of Vietnam has rendered to the Committee from its inception, and of the dedication and devoted attention she has given in helping promote the progress of the SEAMEC Regional English Language Centre.

Dr. Hoi's replacement, Mr. Tran Kim No, who had been nominated by the Minister of Education, Republic of Vietnam, was unable to attend the meeting. However, Mr. Tran Dinh Hy attended the meeting on the last day in representation of the Vietnam Embassy.

The Committee then proceeded to elect the new rapporteur in the person of the member from Malaysia who was nominated by the member from Thailand and seconded by the member from the Philippines.

Discussion

In the discussion that followed, the Committee members made a request for copies of the reports of RELC staff who visited member countries.

There was also the request that, as far as possible, such working papers as are available in time be sent to members for study in their respective countries before proceeding to the meeting.

The meeting was informed that the members from Malaysia and Vietnam had not received their letters of appointment by SEAMEC. RELC had previously received their nominations which were subsequently acknowledged and copies furnished SEAMES. The SEAMES representative promised to follow up on this.

3. RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE SEAMEC CONFERENCE IN JANUARY, 1969

(See Appendix 2)

The Committee took note of the following SEAMEC decisions pertaining to non-SEAMEC countries, viz.

(a) "that the facilities in the various SEAMEC regional centres be made available to persons from such countries provided that candidates from SEAMEO countries shall be given priority";

(b) "that any form of assistance from non-SEAMEO countries or international organisations will be welcome".

It was pointed out by the SEAMES representative that non-member countries are invited to participate in RELC activities but not in membership. Participation in such activities is to be paid for by the respective non-member countries.

4. TRAINING PROGRAMMES

4.1 Evaluation of the First 4-Month Training Course, September-December, 1968.

Dr. Horst, in his report (see Appendix 3), informed the delegates that RELC was giving considerable attention to the evaluation of the training programmes and that such programmes must be subjected to continuing evaluation if they were to meet the changing needs of the region.

It was noted that the Evaluation Report summarised the procedures used for the first 4-month course which had already been previously explained to the members at the last meeting in Malang, Indonesia. It was also pointed out that the report not only described the findings of the questionnaires, and other evaluation instruments used in the evaluation process, but also expressed the frank views of the training programme staff on the difficulties encountered.

Discussion

The Committee took note of the following in the ensuing discussion on evaluation:

(a) There was such a wide range of backgrounds in TESL and English proficiency among the course members that it was very difficult for the staff to chart the courses to meet individual needs adequately, especially since in the present interim period RELC has limited staff, resources and facilities. Examples mentioned were the late start in the operation of the language laboratory and the fact that there were only four full-time professional staff members.

(b) It was suggested by the member from Thailand that not only the course but also the course member be evaluated, that a general report on each individual course member be sent to the Coordinating Committee member on request. Such feed-back would be useful in selecting future course members.

(c) There was a need for guidelines to make courses at RELC more profitable, especially at the present time when there is limited staff. One such guideline already communicated to member countries is that persons nominated, should have sufficient command of English to profit from instruction in English.

(d) On the question of whether nominees from the private sector of a SEAMEC country may be admitted as course members, the SEAMES representative pointed out that such private sectors should have priority over non-member countries. SEAMES, he said, gives strong support to the private sector participation provided there is room. The decision however, he concluded, should be left to the Education Minister of the country concerned.

Recommendation

That a confidential report on the course member be sent to his country upon the request of his Minister of Education.

4.2 Second 4-Month Training Course, February-May, 1969

The Committee was informed that owing to local circumstances, course members from Vietnam could not attend the second course. Laos, on the other hand, could not send any course member, so that her places were reallocated to Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

The SEAMES representative expressed concern over Laos and suggested that RELC adopt special measures for the benefit of Laos.

To the Chairman's question if Laos would consider any arrangements for TESL personnel to go to Laos to release Lao nominees from their respective duties and therefore enable them to attend the 4-month course at RELC, the Lao member answered that her country would at this moment prefer assistance in the development of teacher training programmes. She requested that consultant services from the RELC be made available in the near future for the development of a programme for training English teachers.

The possibility of drawing on the resources of SEAMEC countries willing to help their fellow members was brought out. Mr. J.H. Faulhaber cited examples of other third-country assistance in the region.

Attention was called to the need for selection of tentative special assignment topics by individual course members after consultation with Education authorities in home countries before they come to RELC. This would enable course members to be specific in the description of their suggested assignments at the same time ensure that the provisional topics or areas would be acceptable to the Ministry authorities in the respective member countries. Assignment topics should be finalised in the early part of the course between the course member and his Centre supervisor after due consideration is given to the type of facilities and resources available at the Centre.

The assignment topics of the members of the second 4-month course were studied by the Committee. It was agreed that the topics were suitable. It was also understood that some of the topics were still provisional.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the third 4-month course would begin on 4 August 1969. The Committee agreed that the course should be a TESL/TEFL course and like the first and second courses should include the special assignment requirement.

Recommendations

1. That the RELC provide Laos with consultant services for the development of a programme for training teachers of English.
2. That nominees consult their Education authorities in the selection of assignment topics or areas.
3. That the third 4-month course be a TESL/TEFL course with specific assignment requirements.
4. That the third 4-month course begin on 4 August 1969.

4.3 Post-Training Utilisation And Follow-Up Activities Of RELC Course Members

Discussion

An item of concern raised by Mr. Faulhaber (see Appendix 4) on the utilisation of training received by course members was how to establish lines of communication between RELC and the trainees after their return to their own countries. It was felt that maximum utilisation of the trainees depended, among other things, on the selection of course members and the effectiveness of the training course. Suggestions made by Mr. Faulhaber in his paper on follow-up activities were noted by the Committee.

Recommendations

1. That the National Committee include the Coordinating Committee member as coordinator or chairman;
2. That the National Committee take the initiative to encourage follow-up activities including maintaining 2-way communication between returned course members and the RELC staff;
3. That the members of the Coordinating Committee remain in touch with developments in the areas of training utilisation and follow-up activities with a view to reporting back to the Committee from time to time.

4.4 Certificates And Distinctions

Discussion

The Chairman informed the Meeting that seventeen members of the first 4-month training course received their certificates in December 1968.

It was noted that interim certificates were issued because the SEAMEC emblem and seal had not been designed. The Committee requested the SEAMES representative to expedite action on this matter. A sample of the certificate with dummy emblem and seal was shown to the Committee members.

The Committee was informed that the RELC staff felt that distinctions should not be awarded at this stage when only 4-month courses were conducted. Such awards should be given for work of "exceptionally high quality or excellence" and not for 100-hour paper assignments, for which they had originally been planned.

The recommendation of the RELC staff was to issue Letters of Merit instead. The Committee approved of the issuance of such Letters to the following six members of the first 4-month course:

Mrs. Elena C. Cutiongco
Mr. Ding Huong Doh
Mrs. Victorina P. Flores
Mr. Fok Fook Choon
Mr. Phang Soon Hock
Mr. Prapart Brudhiprabha

Recommendations

1. That Letters of Merit be issued to members of 4-month courses on the basis of outstanding performance in respect of special assignments completed during training;
2. That Letters of Merit be awarded to six members of the first 4-month course as recommended by the RELC Director and staff.

4.5 Fee-Paying Course Members And Research Scholars

Discussion

The Committee took note of the paper on 'Fee-paying course members and research scholar status' (see Appendix 5) and agreed that the RELC may admit as many fee-paying members during the interim period as would bring the total enrolment to twenty-four.

Each SEAMEC country is to nominate three scholarship members and two reserves from which the prospective members may be selected. Selection of the additional members is left to the discretion of the Centre Director.

The Committee emphasised the need for SEAMEC countries to see to it that course members meet the deadline for arrival at the Centre as a delay of one week means a loss of more than twenty-five hours of instruction.

The Committee also agreed that the following three categories of scholars could be admitted to use the facilities at the Centre:

(a) Senior Research Scholars who do short-term research of 1-6 months beneficial to the SEAMEC region without professional supervision. No fee.

(b) Research Scholars who do short-term research of 1-6 months beneficial to the SEAMEC region with professional supervision. Fee: US$100 per month.

(c) Visiting Scholars who do short-term unsupervised research preferably beneficial to the SEAMEC region. No fee.

Professionally qualified Research Scholars could offset the fee wholly or partly by paid professional input at the Centre, provided their professional services are needed.

Recommendations

1. That the SEAMEC member countries observe the deadline as indicated by the Centre for sending in names of nominees for training courses.
2. That course members arrive in Singapore in time to report at the Centre before the course begins. Under exceptional circumstances, the Centre Director is authorised to grant delays of up to seven days.
3. That the Centre, at the Director's discretion, be authorised to admit as many fee-paying members to the training course as would bring the total enrolment each four-month course to twenty-four during the interim period.

4. That fee-paying members from SEAMEC countries be charged the same fees as SEAMEC scholars and be entitled to the same facilities.
5. That tuition for fee-paying members from non-SEAMEC countries be at the rate of US$100.00 per month.
6. That, under specified terms, Centre facilities be extended to three categories of scholars, namely Senior Research Scholars, Research Scholars and Visiting Scholars.

5. NATIONAL COMMITTEES TO LIAISE WITH RELC ON PROFESSIONAL MATTERS

The Committee was informed by the Chairman that in accordance with the recommendation made at the Fourth Coordinating Committee Meeting in connection with the establishment of National Committees to liaise with the RELC staff in order to promote and coordinate activities in several professional areas, National Committees were being formed in SEAMEC countries. The RELC had received from all SEAMEC countries except Vietnam the names of interim or permanent National Committee Members.

The Chairman invited the Committee to study the names received (see Appendix 6) and to give comments.

The following were reported by the Coordinating Committee Members:

(a) The names for Indonesia and Laos were confirmed.

(b) The names for Malaysia were correct. The National Committee would have as its Chairman the Coordinating Committee Member. The replacement of Mr. McGregor, who was on short leave, would be sent in by the Malaysia member.

(c) The Philippines would expand the composition of its committee. The Coordinating Committee Member had submitted one name.

(d) The names submitted by Thailand would be interim in nature.

There was no report from Vietnam as unforeseen circumstances prevented the member from attending the meeting.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE REGIONAL SEMINAR ON TEP TRYOUT AT THE RELC, OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1968

The Specialist in Research Design reported on the progress in implementing the recommendations (see Appendix 7) made by the October-November seminar on TEP. The Committee took note of the following:

(a) No member countries have submitted proposals to the RELC for tryouts of TEP in their own countries.

(b) Work is proceeding on adapting the phonology section of TEP to individual member country needs. An outline of proposed materials will be submitted to member countries for comment before production of materials is begun.

(c) The RELC staff considered the remaining sections of TEP and made the following recommendations concerning the two major sections:

  (i) The grammar section requires extensive revision. It is currently being revised by WERA. The RELC should wait to examine this new version before making further decisions. If the new WERA version is not satisfactory for SEAMEC country use then the RELC should investigate other published programmed materials covering the same topics, rather than undertaking to rewrite the TEP materials at the RELC.

(ii) Revision of the methodology section involves the remaking of several hours of film, plus all the related materials. WERA would like to undertake this revision if financing can be arranged. This financing would almost certainly have to come from U.S. or other non-SEAMEC area sources.

It would not be practicable for the RELC to undertake the revision of the methodology section. In order to do an acceptable job it would be necessary to employ professional film makers. The cost of such a project (as estimated by WERA) would be in excess of the total yearly budget of the RELC.

For these reasons the staff recommends that the RELC wait for further development by WERA. The RELC should keep WERA informed of the requirements of the SEAMEC countries in the hope that some or all of these requirements would be met by a new WERA version of methodology. The RELC should also keep member countries informed of any materials from WERA.

The meeting was informed that RELC has no commitment with WERA. It was noted that TEP materials are the property of the USG and could be reproduced in SEAMEC countries for any purpose approved by USG. The only purpose unlikely to be approved would be reproduction for profit by a commercial or government organisation.

Recommendations

1. That the RELC staff continue the study, refinement, and revision of the phonology section of TEP and continue study of the grammar section. In this connection, close liaison might be maintained with Washington Educational Research Associates (WERA), the creator and distributor of the course, in order that the RELC findings and recommendations can be taken into account in revisions of the course which may be carried out by the WERA.
2. That the RELC Research Section keep SEAMEC countries informed concerning developmental work with TEP including revisions made by both RELC and WERA, and advise member countries concerning promising substitute materials for any of the TEP sections in lieu of revision. The respective National Committee will be the focal point for this reporting.
3. That the RELC Research Section provide each National Committee a detailed description of the materials required for use of each TEP section; their availability for loan, purchase, or reproduction, and suggestions as to how they might be used with existing language lab facilities. Each

National Committee interested in examining or experimenting with any of these materials should submit requests or proposals to the RELC for consideration and action.

7. EVALUATION OF THE RELC PROGRAMMES

The second day's plenary session, with the Vice-Chairman presiding, started with a report (see Appendix 8) by Dr. Krug, consultant from AIR, giving recommendations for the evaluation of the RELC programmes. It was noted that evaluation does not mean a single score or index of success but rather a set of measures that would indicate the Centre's accomplishments and progress in meeting the needs of the member countries. The information on how well the programmes meet these needs can come only from the member countries themselves. Evaluation based on this information can be thought of as "external" evaluation. This was contrasted with "internal" evaluation which consists of determining whether course material is being learned, or whether RELC programmes are operating as planned, without asking whether these courses or programmes really meet the needs of the countries. Both internal evaluation by the RELC, and external evaluation by the member countries are essential.

Discussion

The need to plan for external evaluation as early as possible was stressed. External evaluation includes the precise statement of the objectives in sending each course member to the RELC, and the later determination of whether these objectives were met. The determination should be made some months (or, in some cases years) after the course member returns to his home country. It was noted that the first step in this process was made by the Centre when it requested each country to indicate the anticipated post-RELC assignment for each course member.

The need to focus on programmes (that is, what the member countries are trying to do) rather than on courses was stressed by the AIR consultant. Instead of focusing on the qualifications of course members, the emphasis should be on what the country wants its course members to do when they return. It must be assumed of course that course members have the basic background needed to benefit from RELC programmes.

It was emphasised that it is imperative for member countries to give the Centre in advance adequate information about their specific needs and the growth potential of the nominated course members. Member countries should explain what the nominee's role is in the educational development of his country, why he is a key person, and what he is going to do with his training.

The RELC Development Officer suggested emphasis on problem orientation. The objective he said, was to get course members to think of new procedures or techniques.

The RELC professional staff request that, at least during the interim period, in view of the limited facilities course members should have a sufficient degree of proficiency in English.

Clarifications made by Dr. Krug on the recommendations in his report were as follows:

(a) Each member country should work out a model for external evaluation which should be subjected to continuing review. Member countries may request technical assistance in the development of these models from the Centre's research specialists.

In this connection RELC should prepare guidelines for evaluation for distribution to the member countries.

(b) RELC should continue the development of effective tools for internal evaluation.

(c) The RELC can assume that there will continue to be a wide variation of needs from one course member to another. This situation should be considered desirable, and programmes should be individualised as much as possible to meet these needs.

(d) The RELC Plan should be reinterpreted in terms of each country. E.g. raising such questions as what the RELC plans really mean to a particular member country.

(e) Evaluation procedures should be subject to continual revision in order to keep pace with changing conditions in SEAMEC countries. Dr. Krug stressed that his major recommendation is No. 3 in his paper, that is:

> "To establish a basis for external evaluation, each member of the Coordinating Committee should begin work on the development of specific objectives for each person sent to RELC. These guidelines must be sent to RELC before the course member arrives. They must also be used in the member country to develop specific procedures for carrying out subsequent evaluations."

He suggested that RELC staff could go to the countries concerned to consult with those involved in the development of evaluation procedures.

Recommendations

1. That the development of the RELC internal evaluation be continued;
2. That an external evaluation programme be started in each member country. The programme should consist of
    a) development of member country objectives for RELC programmes including specific objectives for each course member nominated for training, and
    b) development of procedures for subsequent determination as to whether the objectives have been met.
3. That the RELC provide guidelines and technical assistance for the planning and continuing revision of the external evaluation programmes;

4. That pending further development of procedures for specifying objectives, the member countries continue to indicate to RELC at the time of nomination the specific duties of the course members upon their return. It is understood that such assignments are subject to change.

8. RELC CONSTITUTION

Discussion

The Chairman informed the Committee that the first draft of the Constitution had undergone the scrutiny of the Solicitor General of the Government of Singapore and other legal consultants. After the Committee's deliberation, the draft would go to the Singapore Government and SEAMES before it was to be presented to SEAMEC for adoption.

The lengthy discussion brought out the following points:

Re Art. IV., No. 1: In the Coordinating Committee the Centre Director should represent the Centre, not the home country.

Re Art. V., d: The selection of the Centre Director should be one of the functions of the Committee since

(a) Selection by the Coordinating Committee will strengthen the nomination of the Centre Director by the home country.

(b) The Director is a member of SEAMEO and directly responsible to SEAMEC.

The draft was approved with the following suggested revisions:

Article IV

1) The Co-ordinating Committee (hereinafter in this Constitution referred to as "the Committee") shall consist of one representative from each participating State of the Organisation, the Centre Director and a

representative of SEAMES as ex-officio members;

2) The Committee shall meet annually in ordinary session and it may meet in extraordinary session at the request of the Centre Director, or if called by one-third of its members.

Article V

The Committee shall -

(a) approve programmes and budgets of the Centre;

(d) select the Centre Director and approve the terms and conditions of service of the staff of the Centre;

(e) make by-laws, rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution, the charter of the Organisation, and the laws of Singapore, for the management of the Centre;

Article VI

New 4) The Centre Director shall prepare for review and approval by the Committee the annual programme plans and budget for the Centre.

Original 4) and 5) renumbered to read 5) and 6).

9. SEAMES PLAN FOR SPECIAL FUNDS

Report

The SEAMES representative brought to the attention of the meeting some of the resolutions passed and the recommendations made during the Fourth SEAMEC Conference in Djakarta, 7 - 10 January, 1969. He referred the meeting to the document in SEAMEC resolutions, particularly the section referring to funding. (See Appendix 2)

Discussion

The Committee took note of the position of the fund-raising project. The Chairman clarified that special funds are to come from fund-raising activities of SEAMES. It was pointed out that SEAMES is now in the initial stage of undertaking fund-raising.

The SEAMES representative mentioned the expected arrival of a fund-raising consultant from the United States to work with the SEAMES staff and advise on fund-raising both within and outside the region.

The meeting took note of the total project cost and the sources of funding as illustrated in the new brochure.

Also noted was the revision made by RELC on its cost analysis in the Training Scholarship item under the Special Funds. (See Appendix 10)

The Chairman pointed out that figures on training scholarships had been revised for the period of the permanent Centre. The 5-year budget for the RELC Special Fund items, presented in an order of priority established by the Coordinating Committee at the Fourth Meeting in Malang, was brought to the attention of the Committee:

		US$
(i)	Training Scholarships	185,600
(ii)	Coordinating Committee Meetings	4,000
(iii)	Seminars and Conferences	20,000
(iv)	Consultant Services for National Programmes	7,500
(v)	Research Fellowships	7,000
(vi)	Personnel Exchanges	2,500
(vii)	Financial Grants to National Programmes	6,000
	Total Special Funds p.a.	232,600
	Total Special funds for 5 years	1,163,000

10. RELC BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR JULY 1969 - JUNE 1970

The Chairman referred the Committee to the RELC budget estimates made for the year July 1969 - June 1970. The Committee took note of the estimates and the anticipated funding sources. (See Appendix 11)

11. REGIONAL SEMINAR ON NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE THEORY AND METHODS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING ENGLISH, JUNE 1969

Discussion

Provisional arrangements for the fourth regional seminar with the theme "New Developments in the Theory and Methods of Teaching and Learning English" were presented by the Chairman. (See Appendix 12)

The seminar would give emphasis to

(a) THEORIES underlying the different approaches to language teaching and

(b) APPLICATIONS of the theories in classroom situations in Southeast Asia.

This would be the first international seminar convened by the RELC and participants would include TESL specialists and speakers from within and outside the SEAMEC region. Speakers from outside the SEAMEC region would have to provide their own funds. Four delegates had been invited from each member country and it was hoped that the Committee members would be included in the SEAMEC delegations. As SEAMEC country delegates would be supported by RELC funds, it had been requested that these delegates be nationals of the respective countries.

The Coordinating Committee members had been invited to recommend speakers who are nationals for inclusion in the delegations. The members from Thailand and Laos expressed the view that their countries might not have professionally qualified nationals to present papers. They suggested the alternative of inviting non-nationals who know the English teaching problems in their countries. It was made clear such participants would have to secure their own funds for attending the seminar.

These were stressed:

(a) The deadline for sending nominations of speakers and delegates should be observed.

(b) The abstracts of papers should be forwarded to the Centre in time for printing. Texts of some papers would be included in the RELC Journal.

The member from Thailand suggested curriculum levels and TEFL/TESL as possible topics for professional papers to be presented.

The meeting was informed that the dates of the seminar would have to be treated as firm as many anticipated participants and speakers specially invited had already committed themselves to the given arrangements.

Recommendation

That the general scheme of the seminar be adopted.

12. RELC ACTIVITIES FOR THE SECOND YEAR OF THE INTERIM OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME, JULY 1969 - JUNE 1970

12.1 Discussion on RELC activities

The Committee deliberated on the activities for the second year of the interim RELC as outlined in the document "Proposed Year II Activities, 1 July 1969 - 30 June 1970" (see Appendix 13).

The RELC interim operational programme was approved with an amendment.

No. 5.1 was amended to read:

> Continue to evaluate training courses at the RELC to ensure that the RELC training programme meets the needs of member countries; also provide guidance and technical assistance for the planning of evaluation at the national level.

12.2 Regional Meetings and Seminars 1969 - 70

The Chairman referred the members to the proposed dates of some RELC events in 1969 - 70 (see Appendix 14).

Considerable discussion centred on how to consider such matters as job descriptions, terms and conditions of service and recruitment procedures. It was deemed necessary to consult the Ministers of Education of member countries.

It was agreed that the job descriptions of permanent RELC staff, terms and conditions of service and recruitment procedures should be prepared by a Special Sub-Committee.

The Chairman invited nomination of members to the Sub-Committee to go over the working papers before they were sent to the Ministers. Prof. Aurora Samonte of the Philippines was nominated. The Singapore Coordinating Committee member would be Chairman. The other countries were not ready to nominate their representatives prior to consultation with their Ministries.

It was agreed that the Special Sub-Committee meeting should be held from 12 to 14 August 1969, and the Sixth Coordinating Committee Meeting from 7 to 10 October 1969 tentatively. This would give the Ministers of Education at least a month to look into the working papers referred to them by the RELC.

During discussion it was also agreed that the 1970 Seminar should have the theme "Language Tests" and that the Seminar should be held in late June.

Recommendations

1. That each member write to RELC to indicate whether his country is nominating someone to the Special Sub-Committee; if so, to give the name and designation of the person.
2. That the Centre would hear from the member countries not later than 31 March 1969.

3. That the job descriptions of the permanent RELC staff, terms and conditions of service and recruitment procedures prepared by the Special Sub-Committee be referred to the following in this order:

   (a) Ministries of Education through the Coordinating Committee Members;

   (b) The Sixth Coordinating Committee Meeting;

   (c) The Fifth SEAMEC Conference.

4. That the dates of the RELC events in 1969 - 70 be adopted as amended.

13. RELC BULLETIN

The proposals of Mr. Alan Moller in his paper on the RELC Bulletin (see Appendix 15) were approved by the Committee. The Committee agreed that "JOURNAL" would sound more professional than "BULLETIN" and that "RELC" would call attention to the regional effort. It was hoped that the first issue would appear in July or August. The Committee also agreed on a minor correction to the suggested title so that it would read: the RELC JOURNAL -- a Journal of English Language Teaching in Southeast Asia.

Recommendations

1. That the Editorial Advisory Board consist of prominent members of the profession who are nationals of the respective SEAMEC countries;
2. That the Ministries of Education be approached by the Committee members to nominate members to the Editorial Advisory Board.
3. That the Centre Director be authorised to negotiate with a reputable publisher through open bidding for the publication of the Journal for an initial period of 3 years.

14. DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

The delegate from Thailand informed the Committee that the Government of Thailand through the Ministry of Education offered to host the Sixth Meeting. The Committee expressed appreciation of this offer of the Government of Thailand.

The members agreed that the sixth meeting of the Coordinating Committee should be held from 7 to 10 October, 1969 in Bangkok.

The member from Laos volunteered the information that her country would wish to host the seventh meeting in 1970.

AGENDA

1. Report by the Chairman of the Coordinating Committee
2. Resolutions passed at SEAMEC Conference, January 1969
3. Training programmes
    a) Evaluation of the First 4-month Training Course, Sept - Dec 1968
    b) Second 4-month Training Course, Feb - May 1969
    c) Post training utilisation and follow-up activities of RELC course members
    d) Certificates and distinctions
    e) Fee paying course members and research scholars
4. National Committees to liaise with the Regional English Language Centre on professional matters - status reports by Coordinating Committee members
5. Recommendations of the Regional Seminar on TEP Tryout at the Regional English Language Centre, Oct - Nov 1968
6. Regional Seminar on New Developments in the Theory and Methods of Teaching and Learning English, June 1969
    a) Dates and venue
    b) Guest speakers and participants
    c) Programme
7. First RELC Bulletin
8. Planning for annual evaluation of the RELC programme, 1968/9
9. Draft RELC Constitution
10. SEAMES plan for Special Fund (Report by SEAMES representative)

11. Budget estimates for the year July 1969 - June 1970

12. (a) RELC activities for the second year of the Interim Operational Programme, July 1969 - June 1970

    (b) Regional meetings and seminars

13. Date and place of next meeting

14. Any other business

SOME OF THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE FOURTH SEAMEC CONFERENCE, DJAKARTA, 7 - 10 JANUARY 1969 FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE RELC COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Establishment of the permanent Secretariat

1. The Council takes cognizance of the progress made on the negotiation for a headquarters agreement with the Royal Government of Thailand.

2. The Council instructs the SEAMES Director to finalise the negotiation for a suitable headquarters agreement comparable to similar agreements with other inter-governmental organisations, and charges the SEAMES Director to sign the agreement on behalf of the Organisation, after having obtained the approval of the draft agreement by the SEAMEC President.

3. The Council expresses its due appreciation of the valuable support extended by the Royal Government of Thailand in providing a permanent site and in undertaking thereon the construction of a new building for the SEAMES headquarters in Bangkok.

Legalising the regional centres

1. The Council resolves to enter into agreement with the governments of member states of SEAMEO for the establishment of the respective centres and instructs SEAMES to enter into consultation with the governments of the member states to draft such agreements for the approval of SEAMEC. In drafting such agreements, SEAMES should take into account the regional character of the centres as well as their

individual characteristics, but in regard to privileges, immunities and tax exemptions granted by the host governments to their respective centres, there should be uniformity in all agreements as far as possible.

2. The Council instructs SEAMES to enter into consultation with Project Directors to finalise the constitution of the respective centres for the approval of SEAMEC.

Membership and inter-relationships

1. The Council authorises the SEAMES Director to approach Burma and Cambodia with a view to admitting them to the full membership or programme participation.

2. The SEAMEC decision regarding the non-SEAMEO countries is as follows:
   (a) that the facilities in the various SEAMEC regional centres may be made available to persons from such countries provided that candidates from SEAMEO countries shall be given priority;
   (b) that any form of assistance from non-SEAMEO countries or international organisations will be welcome.

3. Considering that the interests and activities of such organisations as UNESCO, UNDP, ECAFE, FAO and ADB are related to the purposes of the organisation, the Council authorises the Director to enter into consultations with such organisations with a view to establishing effective working relationships with such organisations and agencies in order to ensure mutual benefit and effective cooperation.

Regional English Language Centre

1. The Council approves the SEAMES request for an extension of the services of the current Coordinating Committee members to cover the entire period of the interim operational programme in order to ensure continuity in planning at this important stage;

2. The Council instructs the Secretariat to conduct a study on the best method of giving recognition to the certificates awarded by the RELC and report back to the Council;

3. The Council approves the Coordinating Committee's recommendation that National Committees be formed in member countries to liaise closely with the RELC staff on matters relating to library activities, instructional materials development, publications, research and other activities.

Funding

1. The Council instructs the SEAMES Director to fill all the senior professional posts in the approved establishment of the Secretariat under the three-year budget as soon as possible, and to reorganise or reschedule the duties of the Secretariat with a view to providing the necessary staff for the fund-raising duties of the Secretariat. In the event that after this reorganisation of the Secretariat, the SEAMES Director still finds that the approved establishment is inadequate to

cope with the increased duties of the Secretariat, the Council authorises the SEAMES Director to obtain covering approval of the SEAMEC President to negotiate further grant of assistance to SEAMES.

2. In view of the fact that project fund-raising is a joint responsibility of SEAMES and the respective host countries, the Council invites all member countries concerned to keep SEAMES informed of all developments or plans in their fund-raising activities with a view to ensuring coordination of efforts.

3. Special funds scheme as approved by the Ministers at the Third Ministerial Conference in Singapore in February 1968, should include all items as listed under the revised funding plan of the RELC project which was also approved by SEAMEC at the same conference. The tentative list of special fund components in order of priority is as follows:

   (a) Programme participation-scholarships (including training scholarships and research fellowships and grants), seminars and conferences plus those other non-capital, staff and non-operating cost items vital to the functioning of each centre

   (b) Governing Board meetings

   (c) Consultant services for national programmes

   (d) Personnel exchanges

   (e) Financial grants to national programmes.

4. SEAMES implements a programme for obtaining special funds for the first five years in conjunction with the principal donor (USG). The fund-raising target for special funds each year will be determined by the documented needs of the several regional centres.

5. SEAMES in collaboration with Project Directors establishes guidelines for the administration of special funds subject to approval by SEAMEC.

6. SEAMES explores possibilities of using local currency accounts and subsidised travel as mechanisms for member countries' contributions to the special funds.

7. The Council authorises the SEAMES Director to appoint an ad hoc committee to advise and assist him in preparing plans for fund raising for the approval of SEAMEC.

(From draft report adopted at the Fourth SEAMEC Conference)

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST 4-MONTH TRAINING COURSE
SEPTEMBER - DECEMBER 1968

By Donald P. Horst
RELC Specialist in Research Design

From the initial planning stages, the Coordinating Committee has included provision for evaluation of the RELC programs. It has been recognised that, if the Centre programs are to develop to meet the needs of the member countries, an adequate system of evaluation procedures must be developed as an integral part of those programs. Later on the agenda, Dr. Robert Krug, consultant from the American Institutes for Research, will discuss recommendations for a long term approach to evaluation at the RELC. For the present I will restrict myself to describing the results of the evaluation procedures in effect during the first RELC 4-month course, and to mentioning the additional procedures currently being implemented.

Evaluation procedures for the first 4-month courses

Two types of evaluation were applied to the first 4-month course. One type consisted of questionnaires filled out by the course members. The other was the evaluation by each member of the professional staff in his own areas of responsibility. Both student and staff evaluations were primarily subjective.

Course members filled out three questionnaires during the course. The first questionnaire was completed on the first day of the course and simply asked for educational background information. It allowed the staff to assess the appropriateness of the RELC course offerings in terms of the previous course work or practical experience of course members, and in some cases permitted the staff to modify sections of courses accordingly.

The second and third questionnaires were given at the middle and end of the course respectively. These two questionnaires were very similar in content. They asked for evaluations or comments on appropriateness of course objectives, expectations of the course members in regard to the course, value of each subject studied, and general organisation and scheduling, as well as general living conditions, eating and recreational facilities, and so on. Many suggestions from the mid-course questionnaire were implemented during the last half of the course. Other changes suggested in both quesionnaires have been made for the second course.

In January the RELC staff met to make their own evaluation of the first course. The four professional staff members presented their opinions on the effectiveness of the course as a whole and on the individual subjects, based on their experiences in lectures, seminars, and tutorials, and on the special projects completed by the course members. After this meeting a summary of the general observations was prepared by one of the staff, and each of the four professional staff members added a section on his own areas of responsibility. This paper is on file at the RELC, and is summarised later in this report.

Changes in evaluation procedures for the second 4-month course

Like the course itself, the evaluation procedures used in the first course were very much of an exploratory nature. These procedures are being contunued during the second course with only minor revisions, but development of additional procedures has been given high priority by all staff members. The major current effort is in the area of objective tests. At the beginning of the first course it was decided by the staff that, in a non-degree course for senior personnel, it was inappropriate and unnecessary to ask the course members to take written tests on the course material. However, by the end of the course it became apparent that lecturers could not evaluate the effectiveness of their lectures without such tests. During the second course each lecturer is developing appropriate achievement tests for his material. During the third course some of the subjects will have both pre- and post-tests. In addition a test of English aural and reading comprehension has been obtained from Great Britain, and is being used as a pre- and post-test in the current course.

The ultimate question that our evaluation procedures must answer is how well the RELC courses meet the needs of the member countries. By themselves, tests of the kind described above can never answer this question. Additional procedures must be developed to relate the course offerings to the member country needs. I have already mentioned that Dr. Krug will be discussing this problem later in this meeting.

This completes my summary of RELC evaluation procedures. Now let me describe the findings from the course members' questionnaires.

Questionnaires completed by course members

A questionnaire covering background in RELC course areas was completed by course members on their first day at the RELC. This questionnaire gave the staff a good indication of the wide range of backgrounds, even before the first class meetings. Formal TESOL training on the part of the course members ranged from none at all to graduate level. A considerable amount of practical experience was fairly universal. Training in technical areas such as transformational grammar, or psychology and testing was very limited. Wherever possible the staff modified lecture material to suit the backgrounds of the course members. However, the problem of meeting a wide range of needs with a small staff is still one of the major areas of concern at the RELC.

The second and third questionnaires were given to the course members on 17 October and 23 December respectively. These questionnaires were very similar in content, both covering the 4-month course and the general living conditions while at the RELC. There were few systematic differences between responses to the two forms, and I can summarise the results from both of them at once. Eighteen course members replied to the second questionnaire and seventeen to the third.

Responses to the first questions showed that the course members expected and wanted a general TESL/TEFL course, and most of them felt they got pretty much what they wanted. Three members said they were interested in improving their own English. Four out of seventeen indicated that the course was interesting but not too helpful.

Course members rated each of fifteen subjects separately on the basis of how helpful it would be to a second 4-month course member in the same line of work. A continuous scale was used ranging from "Not Relevant" to "Very Helpful". The midpoint was labeled "Somewhat Helpful". A frequency distribution of the seventeen course members' ratings is given below (December questionnaire).

	Not Relevant		Somewhat helpful		Very helpful
A. Methodology of TESL				3	14
B. General Linguistics			5	8	4
C. General Phonetics			7	6	4
D. Structure of English		1	3	13	
E. Syllabuses & Textbooks			6	10	1
F. Preparation of Instructional Materials		1	8	5	3
G. Audio-Visual Aids			9	5	3
H. Techniques of Speech Training			2	5	4
I. Programmed Instruction		2	9	1	
J. Remedial English			3	5	4
K. Psychology and Testing			6	8	3
L. Literature and the Language Programme		1	5	10	
M. Demonstration of TEP			6	4	2
N. Technique of Language Laboratory Usage			7	9	1
O. Research Project			2	6	8

Only four courses received marks below the "Somewhat Helpful" mark (a total of five such marks). "Methodology of TESL" was rated very helpful by fourteen course members. "Special Projects" were rated very helpful by eight members. In general the reactions were very favorable.

Next, the course members were asked to make suggestions as to how the content or scheduling of the course could be improved. The response was highly varied, with many helpful and unique suggestions. However some suggestions were repeated by several members, and these are listed below:

(a) Confine formal lectures to the morning hours (10 members).

This has been done with few exceptions in the current course.

(b) Include more practical work, demonstrations, school visits, etc. (9 members). The staff is working toward this end, particularly after the first month of the course.

(c) Select special project topics earlier, preferably before leaving the member country (7 members).

This has been done by some second course members, but where members have come without a definite topic they have been encouraged to wait until the first month of basic subjects has been completed before finalising their topics.

(d) Provide greater coverage of areas other than spoken English for primary students (with reading, writing, remedial English, and English for older students mentioned) (6 members).

The suggestions are being considered for future courses.

(e) More free or supervised reading time (5 members).

With the development of an adequate library, course members are being given more free time, and lecturers are making more outside reading assignments.

(f) More remedial English for course members (4 members).

Additional remedial English periods have been arranged for the second course.

With the installation of the language laboratory, the facilities for this activity are much improved. Future courses may expand remedial English even further.

Many other useful suggestions were made by one or two course members and some of them have been implemented. The ordering of the above list should not be taken to imply that weight of numbers is the only criterion used by the staff in evaluating suggestions. By way of illustration, the suggestion by nine members that special project topics be chosen earlier has been temporarily set aside by the staff for reasons given above. On the other hand, the suggestion by a single course member that ice-cream be added to the RELC canteen menu was implemented immediately!

This brings me to the final area covered in the questionnaires, general living conditions. Again, course members were fairly satisfied. At the RELC, there were requests for a student lounge and for modifications to the kitchen-canteen area. These suggestions have been implemented.

More facilities for recreation were requested, and possibilities are being explored. Outside of the Centre, there was some minor dissatisfaction with the living and eating arrangements. More satisfactory accommodations in University of Singapore quarters have been arranged for the current course.

In addition to the formal questionnaires described above, the staff and course members spent a good deal of time in informal discussions. The ideas gained in this way are reflected in the staff evaluations given below.

Evaluation by the Professional Staff

I mentioned earlier that in January the RELC staff met to consider the suggestions of the first 4-month course members, and to make their own evaluation. After the meeting, Mr R. K. Tongue, Specialist in Methodology, summarised the general impressions of the staff. I will read his summary now.

EVALUATION BY THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF THE FIRST RELC FOUR-MONTH COURSE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

It was the agreed view of the professional members of staff that there were several features of the timetabling and arrangements for the first course which could be improved.

1. Sequence of courses

In the timetable for the first course, some of the more theoretical subjects, e.g. Psychology, and the later stages of The Structure of English were covered at the end of the course. This was unavoidable, for a number of reasons, but was found to be unsatisfactory.

For the second course, it was agreed that the main theoretical subjects viz:

The Structure of English
Phonology
Psychology
General Linguistics

should be offered as early in the course programme as possible.

This would mean that there would be a very heavy programme of lectures in the early stages of the course. The number of formal lectures would, however, gradually diminish and the more practical sessions became more in number as the course progressed. This would be in line with what the first course-members recommended in response to the Questionnaire.

2. Arrangement of courses

Because of the small number of lectures at the beginning of the first course, we attempted to introduce variation into the instruction by having each lecturer conduct two courses concurrently. This seems to have been a mistake; the course-members said that they found it confusing to try to follow so many different subjects at the same time. It was agreed that, for the second course, only one subject should be introduced at a time (except for the two being dealt with by Dr Topping). Thus, General Linguistics should precede Methodology and Syllabus & Textbooks should precede Instructional Materials.

3. Co-ordination between Courses

The first course-members considered that coordination between the lectures in certain associated subjects was not as close as it might have been. This was a fair criticism but a certain lack of coordination was inevitable in the first course, which was being conducted by lecturers who were not familiar with each other's content and approach.

This will be largely remedied during the second course. Mr Moller will integrate his Instructional Materials course with the AVA sessions and Mr Tongue will attend Dr Topping's lectures on The Structure of English to avoid overlap with General Linguistics.

In addition to these general comments, each of the four professional staff members wrote a brief evaluation covering his areas of responsibility, with emphasis on the subjects he taught. These evaluations are on file at the RELC, but I will summarise the major points that have not been mentioned elsewhere in this report. Comments on specific courses are as follows:

(a) Methodology of TESL: This subject was very well received. In the future more time may be given to the teaching of reading and writing.

(b) General Linguistics was considered by some course members to be a little remote from their practical needs. The staff feels it is valuable, and in future courses will attempt to relate it more closely to practical problems.

(c) General Phonetics: The effectiveness of the course was reduced since there were no language laboratory facilities. With the laboratory, which is now operational, a relatively comprehensive course is being given currently, but there is not enough time to develop high level skill.

(d) Structure of English is a course in transformational grammar. The subject was new to all course members and many found the material difficult, particularly those with difficulty in understanding English lectures. For the second course this subject will be concentrated in the first two months instead of being spread over the entire course period. Periodic quizzes will indicate how well course members are learning the material. Textbooks are on order, and should be a major help when they arrive.

(e) Syllabuses and Textbooks, and

(f) Preparation of Instructional Materials.

These courses were merged and treated as a unit. The late arrival of books, tapes, and visual aids resulted in too much ;theory and not enough practical work. This has been remedied in the current course. An attempt is also being made to improve coordination with the courses in AVA and Language Laboratory Usage.

(g) Audio-Visual Aids was popular, and will benefit from the availability of the language laboratory.

(h) Remedial English should be expanded considerably if it is to meet the needs of course members who expect to improve their English proficiency while at the RELC.

(i) Special Assignments were considered to be a useful learning experience for most course members. It was strongly felt that, due to lack of time and previous training, it was not reasonable to expect major original research projects. It was also felt that course members should be allowed sufficient time to choose a topic if the topic was not settled before arrival at the RELC.

The above subjects comprised the major portion of the first 4-month course. Several short series of lectures may be mentioned briefly:

Testing is an important subject for educators, but unless course members have the necessary background in statistics it can only be treated superficially in a course of this length.

Psychology has been expanded to include background materials on learning theories referred to in other subjects.

Programmed Instruction was not very successful without appropriate programmed materials to study. These materials are on order.

In addition to lectures, each course member participated in three seminars and one discussion session per week. The exchange of views in these periods was felt to be of considerable value. Seminars were particularly successful when based on theoretical lectures. In the second course the theoretical lectures are concentrated in the first two months, with greater emphasis on practical work in the last half of the course. Seminars are also being concentrated in the first two months, resulting in even more profitable sessions.

This concludes my summary of specific comments. Before closing I would like to bring to your attention the two major problems faced by the professional staff in the development of the RELC courses. The first is the wide range of backgrounds of the course members. It is always difficult, and in some cases impossible, to prepare a lecture that will meet the needs of all, or even most of the course members at one time. This problem has been discussed in previous meetings of the Coordinating Committee, and will be considered later in this meeting.

The second problem is the specification of clear cut course objectives. Without such objectives there can be no adequate course evaluation. I believe we will also return to this problem later in this meeting.

Appendix 4

POST-TRAINING UTILISATION AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES OF RELC COURSE MEMBERS

by J. H. Faulhaber, RELC Development Officer

From the very inception of the RELC the question uppermost in the minds of those individuals responsible for the pre-project, development plans was what actions can be implemented to more adequately assure the Coordinating Committee, the Centre's staff and the Ministers of Education that the newly-acquired abilities and skills of the returning course members would be released to improve the standards of English instruction in the schools.

The very fact that only "key personnel" or potential "key personnel" were to be nominated for training scholarships at the RELC implied that these personnel were designated to bring about changes in the on-going instructional practices. We all realised that an educational system has many doors to be unlocked in order to bring about the necessary improvements in instruction - be it a door to a pre-service teacher training program, a supervisory unit within a Ministry of Education, a curriculum or English program committee in a city school system, a national instructional materials laboratory, an English department in a large school and/or a principal's office. And all of us have had a long tenure in working on the problems to upset the status quo and get the innovations required into the daily classroom instruction.

Also, it would seem quite evident in most of our experiences that the individual (key person) on the "firing line", i.e. the supervisor, the curriculum coordinator, the department head, the principal and the classroom teacher will innovate, experiment and apply newly-acquired skills only when the overall professional working climate supports and encourages a reasonable feeling of security and confidence both within himself and in those individuals who hold positions at higher levels in the educational system. In effect, if the major decision-making personnel in an educational system are not involved in the planning and decisions in regard to the changes to be implemented, a minimum of action is likely to take place below them in the system.

If this is a valid contention, then the establishment of a dynamic and active National English Committee is the all-important key to unlocking these doors to the entire school system. I think one can cite any number of situations, where, even in a decentralised system of education, major modifications in classroom practices of the various subject disciplines did not take place until the top educators of the school systems, i.e. the administrators and the professionals in the disciplines became a vital, working component of the instructional reforms. In the U.S. the National Study Groups in Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Languages and Mathematics are prime examples of this important requirement. Eventually, these study groups took on international dimensions as evidenced in recent reforms in some of these disciplines outside the U.S. Of course, in this manner the

RELC can fulfil a strengthening role with the respective National English Committees.

Perhaps something might be said at this point as to how the National Committees can become dynamic and take an active leadership role in effecting instructional reforms via the returning course members. It would seem that the first step is to establish lines of communication between the National Committees and the returning course members by promoting certain follow-up activities with them and especially those activities which encourage and stimulate active responses from the course members. Perhaps, these lines of communication could be most ably achieved by having the Coordinating Committee member of each country, assigned to the National Committee as coordinator or chairman.

At the 4th Coordinating Committee Meeting in Malang we discussed this item of concern at considerable length and at a recent staff meeting at the Centre, the Project Director brought your thinking to the attention of the professional staff. As a result, specific follow-up activities have been compiled for your consideration at this meeting. They are as follows:

(a) The RELC staff could forward periodically, via the National Committees, concise, card-type questionnaires to the returned course members inquiring as to what successful or unsuccessful results they have experienced in applying those new techniques and skills acquired at the Centre.

(b) The National Committees could encourage the course members to write about their successful work experiences since returning to their assigned positions and offer articles for publication in the RELC Journal.

(c) The National Committees could encourage the course members to do some experimental research in their daily operations with guidance being provided from local professionals and the RELC staff.

(d) The National Committees could arrange for the RELC staff members to conduct short seminar sessions with the course members when the RELC staff members travel to the respective countries in between courses at the RELC.

(e) The National Committees could arrange to utilise the course members as resource persons when in-service teacher training courses are being conducted.

(f) The National Committees could involve the course members in working out evaluative criteria for effective TESL or TEFL programs.

(g) The National Committees could encourage other subject discipline committees at the national level to collaborate and jointly plan with the Ministry of Education in developing evaluative criteria for total elementary and/or secondary school instructional programs.

(h) The RELC could reproduce and forward, via the National Committees, research abstracts to the course members on a continuing basis.

In closing it may be appropriate to comment also on the possible causal relationships between (a) course member selections, (b) designation of specific duties each course member will be expected to carry out after completion of the course, (c) RELC training course effectiveness, and (d) post-training utilisation of course members. It would seem that all of these phases of the program operations exert an influence on each other with the result that strengthening of each phase would bring a positive impact upon the overall goal of upgrading English instruction in the schools.

For example, as of the Centre's present experience with two training groups thus far, certain observations indicated these relationships. The present selection procedures for course members have produced a considerable variation of backgrounds among the course members and consequently has influenced the training courses' effectiveness. The limited number of permanent and part-time professional staff have made every effort to overcome the variations regarding TESL/TEFL experience and general English proficiency of the course members but the staff feels that effectiveness of their instruction could be greatly augmented if some course members' English proficiency could be improved within the home country prior to their assignment to the Centre.

One other example considered pertinent is found in the designation of specific duties to be carried out in post-training assignments as has been requested in the nomination letters to the Ministers of Education (078/RELC/IPO/1). In some instances those specific duties have been well delineated but in other instances the duties are so generally stated that effective planning of the scope and sequence of instruction for these individuals is limited until his/her arrival at the Centre.

Some of these difficulties may be alleviated with the opening of the permanent Centre as we will have an opportunity for expanding the course offerings but then too these difficulties may require taking another look at the present course proposals with possible modifications.

February 1969

FEE-PAYING COURSE MEMBERS AND RESEARCH SCHOLAR STATUS

by J.H. Faulhaber, RELC Development Officer

At the Coordinating Committee Meeting in Malang, Indonesia (Sept. - Oct. 1968) discussions were held regarding possible fee-paying course members both from within and from outside SEAMEO countries. As a result of these discussions a recommendation was submitted to the SEAMEC Conference in Djakarta (Jan. 1969) by the RELC Director. This recommendation was accepted by SEAMEC and the resolution in regard to non-SEAMEO countries reads as follows:

> That the facilities in the various SEAMEC Regional Centres may be made available to persons from such countries provided that candidates from SEAMEO countries shall be given priority.

In the light of this authorisation and a number of requests received by the Centre to provide training services both in TESL instruction and in research, some possible guidelines have been compiled for the committee's consideration:

A) For SEAMEO country requests for training additional course members, beyond the allotted scholarship quotas, the course fees will be the same as set forth in the allotted scholarships.

B) For non-SEAMEO training course members or research personnel requiring supervision by the professional staff, the fee should be on a flat rate of $100.00 (U.S.) per month which is just $50.00 (U.S.) more than the established fee of $350.00 for the 4-month course. Thus, a 3-month and a 10-month course would be $300.00 (U.S.) and $900.00 (U.S.) respectively. (This assumes a 4-week break in the 10-month course.)

C) Presently there appears to be three categories of scholars who will be utilising the service of the Centre, namely:

1. Senior Research Scholar
    a. 1-6 months duration
    b. No supervision by staff
    c. Research to benefit SEAMEO countries
    d. No fee.
2. Research Scholar
    a. 1-6 months duration
    b. Supervision by staff
    c. Research to benefit SEAMEO countries
    d. Fee - $100.00 per month.
3. Short-term visiting scholar
    a. 1-4 weeks duration
    b. No supervision by staff
    c. Preferably research to benefit SEAMEO countries if conducted
    d. No fee.

D) Research scholars usually being short of funds and in order to encourage them to utilise the Centre's services, it is felt an opportunity should be arranged for research scholars to offset partial or the total fee through provision of professional services to the Centre during their tenure, such as: instruction, remedial English activities, etc. Thus, by granting $5.00 (U.S.) per instructional hour, a research scholar could defray the total fee by providing 20 instructional hours per month. The requirements of the Centre and the candidate's qualifications will be taken into consideration at the time of the application.

February 1969

NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO LIAISE WITH RELC LIBRARIAN AND HEAD OF INFO

Responsibility of National Committee Member	
A. a) Soliciting and receiving materials from government, departments and other institutions within the member country. b) Selection and sending such materials to RELC Library. c) Relaying suggestions, where necessary.	1. Libr a) b)
B. a) Collecting reports of TESL/TEFL research and special programmes. b) Keeping RELC fully informed of up-to-date developments.	2. Repo rese the

Country	Responsibility	Name	
Indonesia	A B	Mr. Giri Kartono Mr. Sasmidi	 Instructor, English
Laos	A B	Madame Pinkham Simmalavong	Directrice des Etud
Malaysia	A B	Mr. M.P. Sudharkaran Mr. A.L. McGregor	Lecturer, Malayan Assistant Dean of
Philippines	A B	Miss Hortensia S. Benoza	Assistant Chief, Di of Public Schools
Singapore	A	(Mr. Low Kee Cheok ((Mrs. Molly Ng Kuen Song	Specialist Inspecto Education, Singapo Specialist Inspecto Education, Singapo
	B	Mr. Oliver Seet	Lecturer, Teachers
Thailand*	A B		
Vietnam+	A B		

* These 3 names have been received but specific responsibilities not yet assigned:

1. Momluang Boonlua Debyasuvarn,
Acting Dean of Liberal Arts,
Silpakorn University,
Nakorn Pathom, Thailand.

2. Mrs. Mayur
University
National C
Sukhothai
Thailand.

+ Names forthcoming

Appendix 6

ISE WITH RELC LIBRARIAN AND HEAD OF INFORMATION CENTRE

tee Member	Area of liaison work
rom government, ithin the to RELC Library. y.	1. Library materials: a) Publications on all aspects of national education systems. b) Treatises, periodicals, abstracts, bibliographies, indexes, reports, surveys, special studies related to teaching and learning of English in SEAMEC countries, library accessions lists, catalogues, etc.
arch and special -date developments.	2. Reporting system for up-to-date record of TESL/TEFL research and special programmes planned or underway in the SEAMEC Country.

Name	Designation and/or Address
Kartono	Ministry of Education, Djakarta.
di	Instructor, English Department, Institute of Education, Malang.
nkham Simmalavong	Directrice des Etudes, Section Anglaise E.S.P., Vientiane, Laos.
Sudharkaran	Lecturer, Malayan Teachers College, Kuala Lumpur.
McGregor	Assistant Dean of Education, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
ensia S. Benoza	Assistant Chief, Division of Publications and Documentation, Bureau of Public Schools, Department of Education, Manila.
e Cheok	Specialist Inspector (English Language & Literature), Ministry of Education, Singapore.
ly Ng Kuen Song	Specialist Inspector (English as a second language), Ministry of Education, Singapore.
er Seet	Lecturer, Teachers' Training College, Singapore.

ng Boonlua Debyasuvarn,
Dean of Liberal Arts,
orn University,
Pathom, Thailand.

2. Mrs. Mayuri Sukwiwat,
University Development Commission,
National Council of Education,
Sukhothai Street, Bangkok,
Thailand.

3. Miss Angkab Palakornkul,
Supervisor,
Supervisory Unit,
Dept. of Teacher Training,
Ministry of Education,
Bangkok, Thailand.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO LIAISE WITH RELC SPECIALIST IN RESEARCH DES

Responsibility of National Committee Member	
C. a) Assisting RELC Research Unit in questionaire studies and surveys of specific TESL/TEFL problems. b) Assembling, organising and sending to RELC linguistic studies completed in member country. c) Providing full information on research needs and priorities. d) Establishing and conducting evaluation centres for trial of new approaches, when required.	3. Researc of spec researc evaluat

Country	Responsibility	Name	
Indonesia	C	Mr. M. Muchnilabib	Head of Language of Education,
Laos	C	Madame Pinkham Simmalavong	Directrice des
Malaysia	C	Mr. A.L. McGregor	Assistant Dean
Philippines	C	Miss Hortensia S. Benoza	Assistant Chief, Bureau of Publi
Singapore	C	Mr. Oliver Seet	Lecturer, Teache
Thailand*	C		
Vietnam+	C		

* These 3 names have been received but specific responsibilities not yet assigned:

1. Momluang Boonlua Debyasuvarn,
Acting Dean of Liberal Arts,
Silpakorn University,
Nakorn Pathom, Thailand.

2. Mrs. Mayuri S
University De
National Coun
Sukhothai Str
Thailand.

+ Names forthcoming

AISE WITH RELC SPECIALIST IN RESEARCH DESIGN

tee Member	Area of liaison work
tionaire /TEFL problems. o RELC er country. ch needs and ion centres for ed.	3. Research activities - questionaire studies and surveys of specific TESL/TEFL problems, linguistics studies, research needs and priorities, setting up of evaluation centres when necessary, etc.

ame	Designation and/or Address
hnilabib	Head of Language Laboratory, English Department, Institute of Education, Malang.
kham Simmalavong	Directrice des Etudes, Section Anglaise E.S.P., Vientiane, Laos.
cGregor	Assistant Dean of Education, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
nsia S. Benoza	Assistant Chief, Division of Publications and Documentation, Bureau of Public Schools, Department of Education, Manila.
r Seet	Lecturer, Teachers' Training College, Singapore.

ng Boonlua Debyasuvarn,
Dean of Liberal Arts,
orn University,
Pathom, Thailand.

2. Mrs. Mayuri Sukwiwat,
University Development Commission,
National Council of Education,
Sukhothai Street, Bangkok,
Thailand.

3. Miss Angkab Palakornkul,
Supervisor,
Supervisory Unit,
Dept. of Teacher Training,
Ministry of Education,
Bangkok, Thailand.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS TO LIAISE WITH RELC SPECIALIST IN INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIA

Responsibility of National Committee Member	Ar
D. a) Selection, collection and sending to RELC all instructional materials used in the member country. b) Providing information about materials currently being prepared or planned. c) Providing information about materials needs and tentative plans for meeting such needs at the national level.	4. Instructional materia teaching and learning papers, textbooks, re materials for English
E. a) Soliciting and receiving articles from contributors in the member country. b) Advising on distribution within the member country. c) Relaying suggestions as to contents, etc.	5. RELC Publications: Professional Bull Newsletter (Quart

Country	Responsibility	Name	Designatio
Indonesia	D	Mr. Giri Kartono	Ministry of Educ
	E	Dr. S.U. Nababan	Instructor, English De
Laos	D	Monsieur Khampeng Ketavong	Chef de Cabinet, Minis
	E	Madame Pinkham Simmalavong	Directrice des Etudes,
Malaysia	D	Enche Abdul Halim bin Haji Abdullah	Federal Inspecto Educational Plan Education, Kual
	E	Mr Swamipillai	
Philippines	D E	Miss Hortensia S. Benoza	Assistant Chief, Divis Bureau of Public Scho
Singapore	D	(Mr. Low Kee Cheok	Specialist Inspector (Education, Singapore.
		(Mrs. Molly Ng Kuen Song	Specialist Inspector (Education, Singapore.
	E	Mr. Oliver Seet	Lecturer, Teachers' Tr
Thailand*	D E		
Vietnam+	D E		

* These 3 names have been received but specific responsibilities not yet assigned:

1. Momluang Boonlua Debyasuvarn,
Acting Dean of Liberal Arts,
Silpakorn University,
Nakorn Pathom, Thailand.

2. Mrs. Mayuri Sukw
University Devel
National Council
Sukhothai Street,
Thailand.

+ Names forthcoming

RELC SPECIALIST IN INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND EDITOR

e Member	Area of liaison work
LC all ber country. urrently eeds and at the	4. Instructional materials used in the SEAMEC country for English teaching and learning at all levels - syllabuses, examination papers, textbooks, readers, teachers' guides, radio and TV materials for English programmes, other AV materials, etc.
contributors ber country. c.	5. RELC Publications: Professional Bulletin (bi-annual) Newsletter (Quarterly)

	Designation and/or Address
	Ministry of Education, Djakarta. Instructor, English Department, Institute of Education, Malang.
etavong alavong	Chef de Cabinet, Ministere Education, Vientiane, Laos. Directrice des Etudes, Section Anglaise E.S.P., Vientiane, Laos.
in Haji Abdullah	Federal Inspectorate of Schools, Kuala Lumpur. Educational Planning and Research Division, Ministry of Education, Kuala Lumpur.
enoza	Assistant Chief, Division of Publications and Documentation, Bureau of Public Schools, Department of Education, Manila.
Song	Specialist Inspector (English Language & Literature), Ministry of Education, Singapore. Specialist Inspector (English as a second language), Ministry of Education, Singapore. Lecturer, Teachers' Training College, Singapore.

Boonlua Debyasuvarn,
ean of Liberal Arts,
n University,
athom, Thailand.

2. Mrs. Mayuri Sukwiwat,
University Development Commission,
National Council of Education,
Sukhothai Street, Bangkok,
Thailand.

3. Miss Angkab Palakornkul,
Supervisor, Supervisory Unit,
Dept. of Teacher Training,
Ministry of Education,
Bangkok, Thailand.

PROGRESS ON TEP DEVELOPMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON FURTHER RELC RESEARCH ON TEP

By Donald P. Horst

Specialist in Research Design

The purpose of this report is to inform you of the progress on current revisions to the Teacher Education Program (TEP), and to present the recommendations of the RELC staff as to the role of the RELC in the future development of TEP.

The first major research project of the RELC was the evaluation of the Teacher Education Program (TEP). TEP is a self-instructional programmed course in TESOL. Major subjects in the course are phonology, grammar, and methodology. There are shorter sections on testing, audio visual aids, etc. The entire course can be completed in about 250 hours.

The RELC tryout of TEP consisted of training 18 teachers by means of TEP, evaluating the success of the course, and modifying or improving the course wherever possible. In October - November of last year a seminar, attended by many of you, was held at the RELC to discuss the tryout. The report of that Seminar has been distributed to each of you, and it includes descriptions of the procedure and results of the tryout.

The seminar, after considering reports from the RELC staff and from research counterparts from each member country, made three recommendations concerning future of TEP activities in RELC. This report is primarily a progress report on the implementation of these recommendations, so I will begin by reading the recommendations.

Recommendations of the TEP Seminar

1. The RELC staff should prepare a proposal describing long range RELC plans for major revisions of TEP. The methodology and grammar sections were specifically mentioned as areas for this type of revision. The proposal should be submitted to the RELC Coordinating Committee for approval. A specific problem to which TEP is being applied would have to be identified and the details of TEP utilisation would have to be spelled out, indicating equipment and staff requirements.
2. The RELC staff should begin revisions on the TEP phonology section based on available references on phonological descriptions of languages of member countries, and such other information on predictable pronunciation difficulties as may be provided by research counterparts and available course members. Drafts of the revisions are to be submitted to member countries for comments.
3. Member countries interested in utilising TEP should prepare proposals for its use including external assistance required and submit them to RELC.

Now let me consider the recommendations in reverse order:

I have nothing to report on the third recommendation. Todate, the RELC has received no proposals for research on TEP from any of the individual member countries.

The second recommendation was for the RELC to proceed with modifications to the phonology section of TEP. The following schedule was prepared for implementation of this recommendation:

Before the end of the third phase of the TEP tryout (December 1968) research counterparts from Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam should prepare recommendations on supplementary lessons, based on contrastive analyses between their native languages and English. The Ministry of Education of Singapore would post a research assistant at the RELC to work with me in using the library and personnel resources of the RELC to develop comparable materials for the remaining SEAMEC countries, and to take the responsibility for preparing detailed outlines of the proposed lesson materials. These outlines would be submitted to all Coordinating Committee members for comment before proceeding with production of the materials.

The first step has been accomplished. The three TEP research counterparts produced excellent analyses of the English learning problems in their countries, with recommendations on specific lesson material needed. I have made a preliminary study of these reports and begun the task of deciding which lessons could be useful in all SEAMEC countries, and which should be restricted to subgroups of one or more countries.

The Singapore Ministry of Education is currently in the process of selecting a research assistant for this project, and as soon as he is assigned to the Centre the rest of the program will proceed.

Let me turn now to the one remaining recommendation. The seminar established that there were basic modifications or additions needed before TEP, other than Phonology, could be considered ready for tryout in the member countries. Many such changes were spelled out in some detail. The question of the feasibility of implementing these changes was referred back to the RELC staff. The staff has considered two aspects of the question. First, what are the priorities of the required changes. Second, what is involved in making the highest priority changes.

The answer to the first question is fairly straight forward. TEP is basically one package or unit. The major sections are Phonology, Grammar, and Methodology, and the highest priority should be assigned to developing these sections. Unless they are satisfactory, there is little point in working on the secondary topics. Since plans are underway on Phonology, this means that consideration must now be given to Grammar and Methodology.

The nature of the work that needs to be done on the grammar section is fairly clear. In brief, a revision of the content is needed to bring it up-to-date. Extensive editorial work is needed to eliminate errors and inconsistencies, and to revise exercises where needed.

The revision needed for Methodology is not as clear. It was agreed at the seminar that certain additions are needed to cover teaching of large classes, teaching children, etc. There was some feeling that the

TEP methods were too closely restricted to the repeat-after-me technique. It was also suggested that the organisation of the methodology section needed revision. However, it is clear that whatever the exact nature of the changes, extensive rewriting of scripts and reshooting of films would be involved.

In theory there is a range of possibilities for developing these sections. At one extreme, all the work could be done by the RELC. At the other extreme, all the work could be done by some outside organisation. In between these extremes it is theoretically possible to divide the work in any proportions between the RELC and an outside organisation.

The staff was forced to eliminate the first extreme, that is, doing all the work at the RELC. The making of the Methodology films alone would require hundreds of man-hours of work by professional film makers in order to do an adequate job. Even if it were possible to assemble the needed resources it is probable that we would want to assign them to higher priority tasks.

The only feasible approach to the Methodology revisions seem to be to have the work done by some outside source, perhaps with the RELC providing some consulting services. I have been in communication with WERA (Washington Educational Research Associates), the developers of TEP, and only last week received a long letter describing their plans. They are very much interested in doing a complete revision of the films and all associated materials, incorporating at least some of the changes that the

SEAMEC countries have requested. Unfortunately the financing of the project has not been worked out, and they can give us no indication as to when work could be started.

WERA has also indicated that they are planning a complete revision of the grammar section, taking into account the data from the RELC tryout. This revision does not require the large investment that is involved in remaking films, and completion is scheduled for late 1969. At the same time, needed revisions to other sections including Phonology, are being made.

In summary, on the one hand it appears that by the end of this year WERA may provide revised TEP materials that will go a long way toward meeting the requirements the RELC has specified. The major exception is the methodology section. I should add that WERA indicated they would start work on this section too if there were a reasonable expectation of selling the finished products. If any of the countries represented here are interested in such a plan we should inform WERA of this fact.

The second point is that the RELC does not have the facilities to undertake the highest priority revisions.

The recommendation of the RELC staff is that the RELC maintain communication with WERA with the idea of contributing in any advisory capacity that seems appropriate, but to rely on WERA for the production of revised TEP materials.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON EVALUATION AT THE REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE

By Robert E. Krug

American Institutes for Research

A Basic Considerations

The function of evaluation is to enable an organisation to improve its performance by developing systematic information concerning the extent to which the organisation's objectives are being met by its current programs. If evaluative information is to be used effectively by program managers, it must be diagnostic of the program's strong and weak points. It follows that an adequate evaluation must provide a profile of program accomplishments rather than a unitary index of success.

Accomplishments can be defined and measured in two rather different ways. It is almost always useful to distinguish between what can be termed internal and external evaluation. In an instructional setting, internal evaluation is concerned with the extent to which the immediate course objectives are met by the lectures, discussions, readings, and other mechanisms for presenting that which is to be learned. For example, if the subject matter is transformational grammar, explicit objectives can be developed which together described what the student is to be able to do upon completion of the instructional sequence. Internal evaluation is concerned entirely with measuring student performance against these behavioral objectives. Internal evaluation is a necessary but not sufficient component of any system of evaluation.

If, in a particular program twenty instructional hours are devoted to transformational grammar, it is important to learn through proper internal evaluation, what the students have learned. But a far more important question is, "what effect does knowledge of transformational grammar have on the acquisition of English language proficiency by the students of the trained teacher?", and this question cannot be answered by internal evaluation. External evaluation is concerned with more ultimate criteria. In teacher-training programs, external evaluation is concerned with the teacher's effectiveness one, five, or twenty years after training. One objective of nearly all education or training establishments is to produce graduates who will continue to learn long after leaving the institution; the institution would not be viewed as successful if its graduates were using exactly the same teaching methods twenty years later. It is the task of external evaluation to establish criteria and procedures for measuring accomplishment which reflect the value of the training program to the "consumer", e.g., its value to the larger organisations which utilise the graduates. And this kind of evaluation should be conducted by the consumer, not by the training establishment.

There will generally be substantial substantive correspondences between the criteria for internal and external evaluation. Indeed, if there were not substantial correspondence, there would be no rational basis for training at all, and we would presumably return to a perfectly general education which would be offered alike to the physician, the engineer, and the teacher of English as a foreign language. But the obvious and necessary similarities between the objectives of the training program and the objectives of the job must not blind us to the occasional but very real dissimilarities. We will turn later to some discontinuities in the specific context of the RELC program.

B. The RELC Context

By design, the RELC will limit its training program during its first two years, to a series of four-month programs designed for "key persons concerned with English language programs" in each of the seven member countries. Recognising that the student body of "key persons" would represent a diversity of backgrounds, job assignments, TEFL experience, and the like, the four-month program was designed to provide the individual student with alternatives through elective courses, tutorials, and the selection of a problem for a research paper.

The definition of "key person" was deliberately left to each member country. The resulting heterogeneity has been greater than had been anticipated, and presents a very considerable challenge to the staff of the RELC, which has responded as well as could be expected. The instructional staff is after all, quite small, necessarily involved in developing as well as conducting programs, and highly motivated to make the new Centre a success. It is not surprising that from the instructor's point of view, nothing would be more welcomed than a student body which was more homogeneous in regard to proficiency in English and TEFL training and experience.

In this paper I will take the point of view that this heterogeneity is inevitable for the next few years, and however formidable the instructional problem which it presents, it is a desirable state of affairs given the overall role which the RELC is designed to play in Southeast Asia. After a brief consideration of the nature of the heterogeneity, I will try to indicate why I view it as a good thing, why I believe it will disappear as a problem, and then consider some of its implications for evaluation.

First, the nature of the problem. One "key person" in an English language program may be a principal of a school that has been selected as a site for an experimental English program. This administrator may have no TEFL experience, his English proficiency may be modest, but he is clearly a key person who may influence the future of English language programs in his country. Another key person may be a senior instructor whose formal training was gained twenty years ago and who is now not adequately prepared to give leadership to his younger colleagues who are recently trained in the most modern approaches. Another key person may be a very promising young teacher with only minimal training in TEFLwho has been selected to help fill the critical shortage of teachers of teachers with TEFL competence in his country. The needs of these three key persons are radically different, and the RELC must somehow be responsive to the differences.

But this should be the strength of a RELC in any event; it is not a university which offers a fixed diet of courses to a homogeneous student body, but is rather a unique resource which must assist in the solution of a diverse set of problems. Within-program heterogeneity will decrease as the RELC grows and can offer a larger number of programs, but a certain amount of heterogeneity will remain as a healthy sign of the region's confidence in RELC as an institution capable of dealing with diversity. Diversity as a "fact of life" has very direct implications for evaluation, and it is to these that we now turn.

C. RELC Program Evaluation: Short-term

During the first four-month program, the primary attention of the staff was necessarily given to the management of the instructional effort. The subjective evaluation of the course by the instructional staff is given elsewhere in this meeting and no further reference to it will be made in this paper.

During the second program, now in progress, a more thorough evaluation is being made, with primary reliance placed on quizzes and examinations, to monitor student progress toward course objectives. This kind of internal evaluation will continue as a responsibility of the RELC staff, with the resulting information being used to identify and improve areas where students encounter difficulties. While a continuing effort must be made to develop improved instruments and procedures for internal evaluation, RELC has the necessary capability to carry out this effort and no further attention will be given to the matter in this paper.

External evaluation requires more serious attention. For our deliberations, the fundamental fact is that students are, and will continue to be sent to the four-month program for quite different purposes, producing differences between students from the same country as well as differences in the students from the various countries. There are two important consequences:

1. objectives must be determined for the individual student, not for the course, and
2. these determinations must be made by the member country; they cannot be made by the RELC.

The RELC is prevented by virtue of staff size, from offering an entirely unique program for each student. But it is prevented by the above "fact of life" from offering the same program to everyone. It can make an optional response only if each member country will define, as explicitly as possible, what it wants its "key persons" to be able to do when they return from RELC. The first step in this process was taken by the Centre when it requested each country to indicate the anticipated post-RELC assignment for each student. But more specific information must be obtained, the information serving two important functions:

1. it will permit RELC to design special instructional sequences and individualised out-of-class experiences, and,

2. it will provide guidelines for developing criteria for the external evaluation.

An external evaluation, one that focuses on the fundamental question of "do the graduates of this program perform effectively on the jobs for which they were trained?", can be made only if criteria of accomplishment have been established, and it can be made only in and by the member country after the student has been back on the job for a sufficient period of time. It is essential that planning for these external evaluations begin in each country at the earliest possible time. It would seem most desirable for the Coordinating Committee member to take the lead in this effort, perhaps working with the members of the National Committee. The RELC should supply technical assistance to each country, but the primay responsibility for the design and the conduct of evaluation must remain with the country.

D Evaluation: Long-Range Considerations

In considering RELC evaluation beyond the interim years, one point of departure is the multi-national character of the institution. What are the implications of this fact for its programs and hence for evaluation? A second point is that if RELC is not to become a university, and it is clear that SEAMEC does not intend it to be one, what kind of institution is it to be, and what are the unique roles which it can play? A reasonably comprehensive answer to this question was given in the Plan for the Regional English Language Centre. I will focus on but two areas from the Plan, both being outside the direct training mission, and both areas where the RELC should certainly become pre-eminent within the space of a few years. We will take these two as examples and consider their implications for evaluation.

One area is the coordinative role of RELC in cataloging the resources, the plans and programs, and the problems of English language instruction in Southeast Asia. RELC should be able to provide information on the development and tryout of new materials; bibliographies of research in progress (who, what, where); the itineraries of visiting scholars to the region; the availability of specialists from the region who might assist another country with a particular problem; in short, RELC should compile and disseminate, both routinely and on demand, a wealth of information which could be assembled by a single country only with considerable difficulty. The RELC clearly has this charter and the work of implementation has been started. The implications for evaluation are quite direct. Each member country should specify and systematically update its informational needs; the information can assist RELC in establishing priorities, and the extent to which these needs are being met in a year is an indicator of RELC's value to its consumers. In this case, there is no requirement for the development of special evaluative instruments; evaluation is a straightforward matter, consisting essentially of the record of requests for, and delivery of, useful information.

A second important role is as a stimulator of research. RELC may or may not become a place where one goes to do research, but it must certainly become a place where researchers can meet, have their problems and designs reviewed by experts in their fields, and profit from the interchange of ideas with colleagues from the region. RELC will be an unusually attractive site for both senior scholars and graduate students by virtue of its multinational clientele. While RELC will certainly want scholars-in-residence, it can also profit greatly from the presence of students and junior level researchers who come for only a very short period. It should promote the idea that it is a place where one can come for a variable period of time, for specific purposes, and find senior staff available as consultants on research problems. The Centre can be evaluated in part on the extent to which it becomes "the center" for research on English language teaching in Southeast Asia.

Again, some of the implications for evaluation are relatively direct: how many visiting scholars; how many consultations; how many RELC-stimulated projects are going on in each country; how has the quality of research been improved ? But there is also a requirement for a more complex form of evaluation that seeks to measure the larger impact of RELC on the "state of the art" of TESL throughout the region. A considerable effort will be required to design a system for following up all of the many RELC inputs in seven countries; but if evaluation is to be taken seriously, the task must be accomplished.

E. Summary and Recommendations

1. The RELC should continue to develop objective measures of student proficiency for all course objectives. While the primary purpose of such measurement will be to sharpen the courses, the results are obviously evaluative.

2. At the same time, for the interim period, RELC should be less concerned with instructional efficiency than with meeting the heterogeneous needs of its course members. This is simply another way of saying that the primary focus should be on programs rather than on courses, and on external rather than internal evaluation.

3. To establish a basis for external evaluation, each member of the Coordinating Committee should begin work on the development of specific objectives for each person sent to RELC. These guidelines must be sent to RELC before the course member arrives. They must also be used in the member country to develop specific procedures for carrying out the subsequent evaluations.

4. Each country should also develop plans and procedures for evaluating the broader program objectives of RELC, including the non-training programs included in the Plan, such as the two briefly considered in this paper.

5. RELC should provide technical assistance on evaluation to the groups in each country who will be responsible for the conduct of the evaluations. Development of both short and long-range procedures for follow-up should proceed concurrently.

/DRAFT/

CONSTITUTION
OF
THE REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE

Preamble

WHEREAS in accordance with Article IV(10) of the Charter of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation (hereinafter in this Constitution referred to as "the Organisation"), the Council of the Organisation has established a Regional English Language Centre whose main offices shall be located in the Republic of Singapore;

The Council of the Organisation has adopted this Constitution for the Regional English Language Centre.

Article I

Definitions

In this Constitution:

(a) The expression "Centre" means the Regional English Language Centre;

(b) The expression "SEAMEC" means the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council;

(c) The expression "SEAMES" means the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat.

Article II

Purpose

The purposes of the Centre shall be to assist the Member States of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation to improve the teaching of English in their respective countries and to that end, to undertake research publications, and training programmes and other kindred activities within and outside Singapore.

Article III

Organisation

The Centre shall have a Co-ordinating Committee, a Centre Director, and such other officers, faculty, and staff as may be considered necessary by the Co-ordinating Committee.

Article IV

Co-ordinating Committee

1. The Co-ordinating Committee (hereinafter in this Constitution referred to as "the Committee") shall consist of one representative from each participating State of the Organisation and the Centre Director and a representative of SEAMES as ex-officio members.

2. The Committee shall meet annually in ordinary session and it may meet in extraordinary session at the request of the Centre Director, or if called by one-third of its members.

3. The meetings of the Committee should in principle be held in Singapore where the Centre is located unless the Committee decides otherwise.

4. Any member may be permitted to bring observers or advisers to meetings of the Committee. Such observers or advisers shall have no voting rights.

5. The Committee may, whenever it deems desirable, invite observers or advisers from States not participating in SEAMEC, to attend its meetings. Such observers or advisers shall have no voting rights.

6. The presence of at least two-thirds of the members of the Committee is required for the transaction if its business.

7. Each member of the Committee, including the Chairman, shall have one vote and a decision of the Committee shall be made by a majority of votes of the members present and voting. In the event of an equality of votes the Chairman shall have and may exercise a second or casting vote.

8. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of the Committee shall be elected by the Committee in accordance with the rules of procedure.

9. The Committee shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

Article V

Functions of the Committee

The Committee shall -

(a) approve programmes and budgets of the Centre;

(b) make annual evaluations and reviews of the Centre's programmes and budgets;

(c) set the academic standards of the Centre;

(d) select the Centre Director and approve the terms and conditions of service of the staff of the Centre;

(e) make by-laws. rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution, the Charter of the Organisation, and the laws of Singapore, for the management of the Centre;

(f) delegate, from time to time, to the Centre Director such functions, duties and powers as the Committee deems necessary; and

(g) do any other thing necessary or incidental to the exercise of the functions above enumerated.

Article VI

Centre Director

1. The Centre Director shall be appointed by SEAMEC.

2. The Centre Director is the chief administrative officer and legal representative of the Centre.

3. The Centre Director shall assume the responsibility of carrying out the approved programmes of the Centre.

4. The Centre Director shall prepare for review and approval by

the Committee the annual programme plans and budget for the Centre.

5. The Centre Director shall appoint, employ such faculty, staff, officers, managers, agents and employees for the Centre as the purposes of the Centre may require.

6. The Centre Director on behalf of the Organisation shall possess full juridical personality and shall subject to the laws of Singapore have the power to -

(a) purchase any property movable or immovable and to take, accept and hold any such property which may become vested in him by virtue of any such purchase or by any exchange, grant, donation, lease, testamentary disposition or otherwise;

(b) sell, mortgage, lease, exchange or otherwise dispose of any such property;

(c) act, without compensation, as executor, administrator, administrator with the will annexed, trustee under will, deed or otherwise, or in any other fiduciary capacity of any estate or trust in which he may have interest of any kind whatsoever;

(d) contract to do business, and to execute and file all necessary papers in connection therewith, in Singapore or any SEAMEC member country;

(e) sue and be sued in all courts;

(f) borrow money for the purpose of the Centre, to issue evidence of indebtedness therefor, and to secure the same by mortgages or otherwise; and to lend money and property and assets for the purposes of the Centre, with or without security;

(g) do all other things necessary or incidental to the exercise of the powers above enumerated.

Article VII

Relations with SEAMEC

The Centre Director shall submit an annual report of the activities of the Centre to SEAMEC.

Article VIII

Amendment

This Constitution may be amended upon receiving the approval of a simple majority of the participating members of the SEAMEC present and voting.

Appendix 10

FROM "RELC DATA SUBMISSION TO SEAMES FOR DEVELOPING STRATEGY AND PLANS FOR FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES" OCTOBER 1968

It is in the Training Scholarships item under the Special Funds that the RELC must revise its cost analysis and increase the amount. The original cost analysis as set forth in the RELC Proposed Development Plan, p. 25 is now unrealistic in the light of our present experience with the first group of trainees at the interim Centre and the anticipated costs of the International House arrangement of the permanent Centre. The original cost analysis was based on the type of room and board available to students at the University of Singapore. The per diem or subsistence part of the scholarship cost now requires revision. The breakdown of subsistence cost should now read as follows:

Subsistence per month per trainee

Housing	US$	90.00
Food		100.00
Out of Pocket		40.00
Medical Insurance		7.00
	US$	237.00

Breakdown figures and revised scholarship estimates are now as follows:

a) Breakdown to indicate per scholarship cost

	3-month course (US$)	4-month course (US$)	10-month course (US$)
Tuition	350	350	650
Subsistence	711	948	2,370
Books and Supplies	35	35	35
Travel	160	160	160
	1,256	1,493	3,215

b) Total cost of training scholarships per year

	US$
3-month course (1)	
21 scholarships @ $1,256	26,376
4-month course (2)	
42 scholarships @ $1,493	62,706
10-month course (1)	
30 scholarships @ $3,215	96,450
	185,532

say, US$185,600

5-year budget for the SEAMES fund-raising team

Below is the 5-year budget for the RELC Special Funds items presented in an order of priority established by the Coordinating Committee at the Fourth Meeting held in Malang, 30 September - 2 October 1968:-

		US$
(i)	Training Scholarships	185,600
(ii)	Coordinating Committee meetings	4,000
(iii)	Seminars and Conferences	20,000
(iv)	Consultant services for national programmes	7,500
(v)	Research Fellowships	7,000
(vi)	Personnel Exchanges	2,500
(vii)	Financial Grants to national programmes	6,000
	Total Special Funds p. a.	232,600
	Total Special Funds for 5 years	1,163,000

Appendix 11

REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE
ESTIMATED OPERATIONAL BUDGET
FOR THE YEAR JULY 1969 - JUNE 1970

1. Central Project Office

		(US$)	(US$)
A. Salaries			
Director		10,000	
Registrar and Bursar		7,200	
Librarian and Head of Information Centre		6,800	
**3 professional specialists from UK each @ US$10,200 p.a.	30,600		
*Local support contribution by Government of Singapore @ US$400 x 3 pm	14,400	45,000	
Part-time Lecturers		2,000	
*2 Research Assistants, one for TEP and one for instructional materials development, @ US$550 pm		13,200	
Language Laboratory Assistant		4,800	
Secretary		3,000	
4 Clerk-typists @ US$1,920		7,680	
2 Office Attendants @ US$720		1,440	
*3 watchmen, 1 gardener and 1 cleaner		4,000	
Driver		720	105,840 c/f

		(US$)	(US$)
b/f			105,840
B. Operational Costs			
*Interim RELC with furniture @ US$900 pm		10,800	
*Maintenance of building, grounds and furniture		1,200	
*Housing			
Subsidised Government housing for staff members	9,000		
Initial renovation of 1 house	2,000		
Maintenance	2,400	13,400	
Vehicle operation and maintenance		1,300	
Supplies, postage and cabling		5,000	
*Utilities (water, electricity and gas) @ US$200 pm		2,400	
AVA materials		1,000	
Insurance		760	
Equipment maintenance		1,000	
Representation		1,000	37,860
C. Staff travel and perdiem			5,000
2. Regional Seminar (1) and special regional meeting (1)			14,000
3. Coordinating Committee meetings (2)			8,000
4. Training Scholarships			43,300
5. Publications			
A. Newsletter		1,000	
B. Bulletin		2,000	3,000
		c/f	217,000

		(US$)	(US$)
	b/f		217,000
6.	*Legal and specialist consultants (drawing up contracts and conditions of service for all categories of RELC staff estimated @ 100 man-hours @US$10)		1,000
7.	+Anticipated contribution from non-USG sources (visiting lecturers, materials, etc.)		5,000
8.	Contingency		3,000
			US$ 226,000

From non-USG sources

* Government of Singapore contribution

** UK Government contribution through the Government of Singapore

+ Anticipated non-USG sources

Footnote: Many other forms of Govt. of Singapore contribution such as TV and radio publicity, support service of Singapore Ministry of Educational officials have not been included in the above budget estimate.

Appendix 12

PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENTS
for the
FOURTH REGIONAL SEMINAR
# of the
SEAMEC REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE CENTRE

from June 9 to June 14, 1969

THEME: "NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE THEORY AND METHODS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING ENGLISH"

The Seminar Planning Committee proposes to organise the Seminar along the following lines:

The first part of the Seminar, two to three days, will be devoted to a consideration of the various THEORIES underlying the different approaches to the problems of language teaching methodology. It is hoped that the papers to be delivered and the subsequent discussions will fall within the general framework of a dialogue between the proponents of the theories which may generally be labelled "structuralist" and the supporters of newer theoretical models and approaches, including, but we hope not exclusively comprising, the Transformational/Generative school of thought.

Since it is presumed that all the participants are likely to be interested in the linguistic theories on which language teaching methods depend, we propose that this stage of the conference should be conducted in plenary session.

For the second part of the Seminar, we propose to divide up into three groups to discuss the APPLICATIONS of the theories considered above in the English language classroom. The groups, Section Meetings as they will be called, will probably deal with the following general topics:

SECTION A: - "The Teaching of Spoken English".
SECTION B: - "The Teaching of Reading".
SECTION C: - "The Teaching of Writing".

It is not intended that attachment to one or other of these sections should be fixed and unchanging; participants at the Seminar will be free to select the Section Meeting that they would like to attend on each occasion. Nevertheless, it is hoped that a certain nucleus of participants will consistently attend the same Section to ensure a certain amount of continuity in the discussions.

Finally, on the last day, the Chairman of the Section Meetings will report on the findings of their groups to another plenary session of participants; these reports will then be discussed in detail.

It is the tentative aim of the Planning Committee that about thirty papers, of 40 minutes or so, should be presented in all. About ten of these will be "theoretical' and about twenty "applied". Of the total of thirty papers, about half will be delivered by nationals of the countries of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation. The remainder will be given by non-Regional specialists, some of whom work in the Region and some of whom will be coming from countries like the United States and Britain where English is the first language.

A number of distinguished specialists from outside the Region have already accepted an invitation to participate, pending the availability of financial support to cover their travelling expenses and subsistence. Among the persons who seem more or less certain to be attending are:

Dr Ronald Wardhaugh, Director, English Language Institute, University of Michigan.
Professor Francis Johnson, University of Papua and New Guinea.
Dr Gerald Dykstra, Chief Curriculum Consultant, Hawaii Curriculum Center.
Dr A.R.B. Etherton, Dept. of English, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
Mrs Kathleen Kruizinga, well-known writer of textbooks used in the Region.

SEAMEC member countries are sending a strong team of specialists, and there will also be speakers from the RELC staff, and agencies such as the British Council whose work is closely concerned with the teaching of English as a second or foreign language.

We expect to have a total of about one hundred participants and observers attending.

It is hoped that a substantial exhibition of books and aids to the teaching of English as a second/foreign language will run concurrently with the proceedings of the Seminar.

Further details about the content and organisation of the Seminar will be issued as they become available.

(R.K. Tongue)
Chairman,
Seminar Planning Committee.

RELC Interim Operational Programme

Proposed Year II Activities, 1 July 1969 - 30 June 1970

1.	Training Programmes: Conduct two successive 4-month courses, each for 21 key people from SEAMEC member countries	Two training cours First 4-month cou Second 4-month c
2.	Regional seminars and special meetings: Hold one regional seminar and one special regional committee meeting on job descriptions, staff service conditions and recruitment procedures	Three regional sem Regional Seminar Regional Seminar April 1968. Regional Seminar Regional Seminar Teaching and Le
3.	Information and Clearing House Activities:	
	3.1 Publish quarterly newsletter	Two issues have be
	3.2 Publish bi-annual professional journal	First issue is plan
	3.3 Continue to arrange for exchange of materials with organisations and institutions dealing with TESL and TEFL	Response to RELC At present 63 orga with RELC. More
	3.4 Establish reporting system for up-to-date record of TESL research and special programmes, planned or underway in in the region	Procedures for im Effective liaison b

Appendix 13

nterim Operational Programme
Activities, 1 July 1969 - 30 June 1970

	Remarks
or 21 key	Two training courses will have been concluded by June 1969: First 4-month course, September - December 1968 Second 4-month course, February - May 1969
onal committee ions and	Three regional seminars have been held and one is being planned: Regional Seminar on the Development of the RELC, Singapore, Sept. 1967. Regional Seminar on the Training of English Language Teachers, Singapore, April 1968. Regional Seminar on the TEP Tryout at the RELC, Singapore, Oct - Nov 1968. Regional Seminar on New Developments in the Theory and Methods of Teaching and Learning English (June 1969)
	Two issues have been published: First issue, September 1968 Second issue, December 1968
	First issue is planned for June 1969.
als with TESL and TEFL	Response to RELC invitation to exchange materials has been very encouraging. At present 63 organisations and institutions have exchange arrangements with RELC. More are being added to the list.
record of TESL or underway in	Procedures for implementing reporting system have been established. Effective liaison between National Committees and RELC staff is required.

3.5 Develop an inventory of TESL institutions, courses and personnel resources within the region	
3.6 Assemble, organise and prepare for printing and distribution bibliographies of TESL/TEFL studies completed to date in the region	
4. Library:	
4.1 Continue to procure volumes, periodicals and other instructional materials for Interim Programme	Foundations of the REL items. 64 periodical exchange. There are
4.2 Prepare lists for permanent Centre Library	
5. Research:	
5.1 Continue to evaluate training courses at the RELC to ensure that the RELC training programme meets the needs of member countries; also provide guidance and technical assistance for the planning of evaluation at the national level.	Development of evaluat Included were writte designed questionnai cover subject matter Dr Robert E. Krug, co prepare recommenda
5.2 Continue the development of the TEP phonology course for use in member countries as recommended by the Coordinating Committee. Continue to explore possibilities for cooperating with the producers of TEP in major revisions of the methodology section	The 10-month tryout o regional basis in No Oct-Nov 1968, the R for major revisions
5.3 Initiate questionnaire studies and other surveys of specific TESL problems in the region	A comprehensive surv situation in SEAMEC surveys of specific T

	Remarks
rses and nd distribution ted to date in	
other instructional	Foundations of the RELC library have been laid. Present collection is 2,600 items. 64 periodical titles are being received through purchase, gift or exchange. There are 122 reels of tape, 51 records and 10 films.
ELC to ensure that ds of member l assistance for the	Development of evaluation procedures began during the first 4-month course. Included were written evaluations by the professional staff, and three specially designed questionnaires completed by course members. Diagnostic tests to cover subject matter are being prepared for subsequent courses. Dr Robert E. Krug, consultant from AIR, visited the RELC in February 1969 to prepare recommendations on comprehensive evaluation procedures.
gy course for use Coordinating s for cooperating s of the	The 10-month tryout of TEP at the RELC was successfully completed on a regional basis in November 1968. As the result of a regional seminar in Oct-Nov 1968, the RELC has prepared proposals describing long-range plans for major revisions of TEP for the approval of the Coordinating Committee.
eys of specific	A comprehensive survey through questionnaire of the existing English teaching situation in SEAMEC countries was made in June 1967. Follow-up studies and surveys of specific TESL situations are intended.

5.4	Prepare plans for trial of new approaches (other than TEP) to language instruction and training of language teachers (e.g. programmed texts, teaching films, ITA, controlled composition method, etc.)	At present there is a Singapore ex-cou medium schools in
5.5	Develop an inventory of research needs and priorities for the region	
6.	Instructional Materials:	
6.1	Continue to procure samples of texts, aids and other TESL instructional materials from within and outside the region	Samples of texts an SEAMEC and non publishers. More through the Nation
6.2	Develop as complete as possible an inventory of materials used in the region for English teaching and training teachers of English with a view to determining the needs of the region	To compile this inve Committees and th
7.	Public Relations and Fund-raising:	
7.1	Continue to broaden professional contacts and publicise RELC activities	A good start has be year, professional organisations in m
7.2	Fund-raising programme: communicate with possible donors; travel where necessary	
8.	Permanent RELC	
8.1	Continue to monitor the construction of permanent RELC	
8.2	Continue to prepare list of and procure equipment, furniture and other commodities	

	Remarks
er than TEP) e teachers (e. g. rolled composition riorities for the region	At present there is a tryout on a small scale of oral materials prepared by a Singapore ex-course member (first 4-month course) for non-English medium schools in Singapore.
d other TESL le the region of materials aining teachers ds of the region	Samples of texts and other materials have been generously supplied by SEAMEC and non-SEAMEC countries, local and overseas educational publishers. More materials are expected to come from SEAMEC countries through the National Committees. To compile this inventory, effective liaison is required between the National Committees and the RELC staff.
publicise possible	A good start has been made. Before the end of the present interim operational year, professional contacts with at least 100 associations, institutions and organisations in many countries will have been established.
manent RELC pment, furniture	

8.3 Prepare job descriptions of all administrative and professional staff for the permanent RELC

8.4 Plan recruitment procedures and draw up terms and conditions of service for all categories of staff in the permanent RELC

8.5 Arrange for appointment of staff

---

9. Coordinating Committee Meetings:

Convene a maximum of two RELC Coordinating Committee meetings

B

Appendix 14

PROVISIONAL DATES OF SOME RELC EVENTS IN 1969 - 1970

1969

4 August - 29 November	Third 4-month course (17 weeks)
12 - 14 August (tentative)	Special Sub-Committee Meeting at RELC on a) Job Descriptions of permanent RELC professional staff, b) terms and conditions of service, and c) recruitment procedures
7 - 10 October (tentative)	Sixth Coordinating Committee Meeting, Thailand

1970

5 January - 2 May	Fourth 4-month course (17 weeks)
Early March (tentative)	Seventh Coordinating Committee Meeting
Late June (tentative)	Regional Seminar Theme: Language Tests

Appendix 15

RELC BULLETIN

by Alan D. Moller
RELC Specialist in Instructional Materials

Since the end of the first four month course a considerable amount of thought has been given to the planning of the RELC BULLETIN. It should be realised that a publication of this nature together with an annual international seminar are the major forms of professional contact the RELC can maintain with S.E. Asia and with other countries. Fruitful professional contacts are essential for RELC's future efficacy. With this in mind and in the light of recommendations made by the 4th Coordinating Committee the following proposals are submitted.

Title The R.E.L.C. JOURNAL, subtitle - A Journal of English Language Teaching in S.E. Asia.

It is felt that the term 'Bulletin' is not a suitable term for a professional periodical. It even implies some overlap with the Newsletter. The term Journal seems more appropriate. It is also felt that although the letters RELC should appear in the title they will mean very little to most people at this early stage. Since the Journal is aimed primarily at those concerned with teaching English in S.E. Asia this fact should be conveyed in a subtitle.

Aim The Journal aims to be a source of information and ideas on theories, research, methods and materials related to language learning in general and English in particular relevant to the situation in S.E. Asia. As such it should be of interest to administrators and educators in Ministries of Education, Universities and other institutions of higher learning and research, teacher training colleges and schools. Contributions will be essentially from people at work in S.E. Asia.

Editorial 1. It is proposed that an Editorial Advisory Board be established. The Board should consist of prominent members of the profession in the SEAMEC countries - ideally one from each country. Members who accept an invitation to join the Editorial Advisory Board would be expected

- to offer advice to the Editor on the content and character of the Bulletin;
- to encourage professional colleagues and others in their country to submit articles for the Journal;
- to receive articles from contributors in the home country and decide whether to forward them to the Editor with comments or not;
- to comment on any articles submitted by the editor;
- to support the publication in any other way possible.

2. An Editorial Committee consisting of four professional members of staff and the Librarian to assit the editor with deciding on the suitability of contributions submitted for publication and to advise on all editorial matters.

3. The Editor will maintain close contact with members of the Editorial Advisory Board and the Editorial committee. He reserves the right to make the final decision on the content of each issue. He will also maintain contact with the publishers and printers and members of the National Committees appointed to liaise with the Editor.

Content will comprise main articles, reviews notes and perhaps correspondence at a later stage.

1. Main articles should be between 1.000 and 5,000 words in length. Where possible articles will conform to a theme e.g. in the first issue it is hoped that articles on current programmes and research in the region will be submitted. While it is hoped that one or two contributions in each issue may come from outside the region, the majority of contributions should be from the region.

2. Notes will be shorter and pertain to developments and items of interest which either do not merit a lengthy article or will be treated at greater length in a later issue e.g. introduction of a new syllabus, revision of examinations, the beginning of a new project.

3. Reviews will cover recently published theoretical works, reference books, practical books, relevant periodicals and textbooks and other instructional materials.

Format 9" 6" with two tone cover, containing 64 pages.

If in due course the supply of material is prolific the number of pages could be increased, but in the beginning it may be difficult to fill 64 adequately!

Frequency of publication - twice a year, the very first issue to be free.

The first issue dated June 1969 will appear in July or possibly August.

Fee Authors will receive no fee. This position could be reviewed if the magazine becomes profitable but no more than a token fee could ever be contemplated. Authors will receive a certain number of free off prints of their articles.

Copyright There is no problem when "fair quotes" are made providing the author's name, publisher and date are given. It is proposed that R.E.L.C. takes out copyright for all articles. Permission will normally be given for reproduction but blanket permission to reproduce could lead to abuses which would be against the interests of the authors and RELC. Authors would also be asked to sign a form indicating that copyright on their article has not previously been taken out. This could save the Editor embarrassment!

Role of National Committees The member concerned to liaise with the Editor would be expected:

1. To actively encourage suitable persons to write and submit articles for publication. Any articles received by him should be forwarded to the national member of the Editorial Advisory Board, if there is one, or direct to the Editor.
2. To encourage as wide a readership as possible within his country and to encourage suitable institutions to take out subscriptions.
3. To submit mailing lists to the Editor containing names of people and institutions who should receive a copy of the first issue.

Timetable Manuscripts to be submitted by May 31 for the first issue and November 15 for the second.

Printing and Publishing This is considered separately in a confidential annexe to this paper.

In conclusion it must be said that the Journal will flourish only if the considerable experience and talent available in the SEAMEC countries can be encouraged to contribute material. If the flow and quality of contributions from S.E. Asia is not begun and maintained, the unique opportunity and character which this publication promises will not be realised and survival will be a struggle. Member countries have as important a part to play as R.E.L.C. and the publisher.

SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE HON. JUAN L. MANUEL, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND ACTING UNDER-SECRETARY OF EDUCATION, PHILIPPINES, AT THE OPENING CEREMONY OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE RELC COORDINATING COMMITTEE 4 March 1969

Distinguished Members of the Coordinating Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the Department of Education, let me extend to all of you a most warm and sincere welcome.

We feel honored that the Coordinating Committee of the SEAMEC Regional English Language Centre at Singapore, composed of one representative each from Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam, has chosen the Philippines as the site of its Fifth Meeting. It is our hope that this meeting will be as successful as the previous meetings held at Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, and Malang. And it is our wish that, during your brief stay in our country, you would try to see as much of it as possible, if only for you to appreciate all the more the mutuality of circumstances under which our various peoples live, let alone to sense the identity in our interests and aspirations. I am glad to know that the Organising Committee for this meeting has made certain arrangements toward that end.

May I say that, coming soon after the graduation of the first group of trainees from the four-month TESL course offered by the English Language

Centre, this Fifth Meeting is at once important and significant. The seven member nations of the SEAMEC have cause, indeed, to rejoice over the first fruits of their joint endeavor in this regard, and to celebrate, as it were, their success, modest as it may be. We therefore look forward to this Fifth Meeting, not only as a happy occasion, but as a sanguine and confident one - with all of us fired by an eagerness to project our common goals further, and filled with the assurance that in real and sincere cooperation there is little room for failure.

If I remember right, it was at the Second Conference of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education held in Manila on November 25-28, 1966, that the proposal to establish a Regional English Language Centre at Singapore was approved. And you will agree with me that much indeed has been accomplished since that conference. This is to the everlasting credit of the members of the Coordinating Committee, under the leadership of Mrs. Tai Yu-lin, who did the prodigious spade work to make the 1966 proposal the reality that it is today. Now we can congratulate them for performing a magnificent job. We also wish to take this occasion to thank the government and the good people of Singapore who gave the site for the Centre and who are undertaking the big task of erecting a many-storied edifice to house the Centre - a building SEAMEC can truly be proud of.

Training key people in the teaching of English is only one of our projects. We have a long way to go before it can be said that the Regional

English Language Centre has left its mark on education in Southeast Asia. But every little progress we make together will be one step towards better communication and deeper intercultural understanding, not only among the seven member nations of SEAMEC, but between our countries and the rest of the world. As long as English continues to be the language of commerce, science and technology, and international communication, we will need it to keep pace with the advances in all fields of human endeavor in this age of rapid change. We will need it as a tool of economic development and as a means of keeping in the mainstream of events in the world today. Without the useful tool of international communication that English has become, and which is available, fortunately, to all of us, we would probably have great difficulty understanding each other at this conference.

The Regional English Language Centre will be as good and effective only as interested member countries can make it. It will grow in influence in proportion to our support. Already it is an eloquent symbol of regional cooperation among nations with common economic goals and common aspirations for more and better education for the peoples of these member countries. It could be more than this. It could be a symbol of the kinship among our peoples, nay, of humanity itself - of humanity with a common dream and a common goal: security and dignity for all.

Indeed, the Centre is an investment in people, in humanity. It was an economist who said, "The most valuable of all capital is that invested in human beings."

Again I welcome you all, and to the members of the Coordinating Committee and others who will participate in this meeting I extend every wish for their success.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MR. THAVISAKDI SRIMUANG, SEAMES REPRESENTATIVE, AT THE OPENING CEREMONY OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE RELC COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

4 March 1969

Mr. Under-Secretary of Education, Your Excellency, the Ambassador, Distinguished Members of the RELC Coordinating Committee, Honoured Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I consider it a real pleasure and privilege to represent the SEAMES Director in this Opening Ceremony of the Fifth Meeting of the RELC Coordinating Committee. Mr. Sukich Nimmanheminda, SEAMES Director, requested me to convey to the meeting his best wishes for the success of the Coordinating Committee's deliberation. He particularly regrets that the pressure of official commitments at the SEAMES Headquarters prevents him from attending this meeting personally, much as he would have liked to do so.

As for myself, this is not the first time I attend the RELC Coordinating Committee's meetings. I can truthfully say that except for the fourth meeting in Malang in Indonesia, I have had the privilege to attend all the other meetings of the Coordinating Committee. As in the case of all other SEAMEC project centres, I have had the unique privilege of associating myself with the development of this regional centre right from its inception, and have watched its progress with considerable interest, if only because of the rapid growth of the project planning and operational activities, as well as the tendency for this regional centre to become, in many respects, the trend setter for a few other SEAMEC regional centres of education.

As many of you in this distinguished gathering may be well aware of, the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organisation (or SEAMEO) has just emerged from an interim period of some three years, during which time the movement in regional cooperation in education has had the opportunity to lay the minimum but essential foundation for a permanent and viable regional organisation. The main objective of this Organisation is to work for the betterment of education in Southeast Asia by creating or strengthening regional education centres of excellence. The various member countries offer, individually and insofar as is possible, the facilities of the most developed educational institutions for the benefit of the region as a whole. In some instances, new regional education institutions have to be created to serve the purpose as is the case of the Regional English Language Centre in Singapore. The institutional building achievement of the past three years have shown that under the aegis and authority of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education, and with adequate technical and financial resources, the academic world in its separate specialties could be brought together, as has never been done before in the history of this part of the world, and could be encouraged to devise the most suitable cooperative arrangements for the betterment of education in this region.

As from last January 1969, the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education has become formally and permanently established with its juridical personality. The immediate major task that lies ahead will focus on the mobilisation of resources both from within the region and from outside Southeast Asia in order to carry out the great undertakings that we in the region have set ourselves to. It may be advisable, from time to time, to review the scope, direction and magnitude of the programme activities of the various SEAMEC regional centres in order to effectively meet the needs of the region. Failure to mobilise adequate resources for the regional centres or failure on the centres' part to reflect the needs and requirements of the region may seriously endanger the continuation of the regional cooperation movement as a whole. Another important type of undertakings by the permanent SEAMEO Organisation lies in the identification and development of new project areas to serve the felt needs of the region. However, in view of the financial commitments incurred by the existing project centres, new project areas will certainly have to be screened with care in order to avoid placing too great a burden on the limited resources of the member countries.

Turning now to the Regional English Language Centre in particular, there are ample reasons to congratulate the Centre for its achievement in surmounting the major problems of institution building. Thus the minimum initial plan for the development of the Centre for the next five years or so has been well formulated and accepted at the national and regional levels. Operational activities in the form of professional seminar and academic training as well of innovational research have been undertaken, although they may be somewhat modest in scope and magnitude at this early stage. The funding pattern for the planned period has been underwritten by both the host country, Singapore, and the principal donor, the USG, while a portion of the project cost defined as Special Fund has been assigned to the SEAMES Headquarters to raise. The future task for the Centre, broadly speaking, seems to be to make the vision and dream couched in the projected plan come true. This will involve the building of the centre building of over twenty storeys, the expansion of the centre activities in order to make its impact felt at the national and local levels of member countries. The Centre, through the wisdom and guidance of the Coordinating Committee, may have to take the initiative in making the Regional Centre meaningful at the national level. In some member countries, it may involve the creation of a strong national centre for the English Language Education, which will coordinate closely with the Regional Centre in Singapore.

Ladies and Gentlemen: before I conclude may I on behalf of the Organisation thank the Government of the Republic of the Philippines through the Department of Education, for graciously consenting to host this meeting of a project centre of the Organisation. SEAMES and the various project centres within its orbit have always been confident that this Republic will always support regional activities in order to strengthen the cohesion and stability of Southeast Asia. And lastly let us hope that the Coordinating Committee will meet with every success in its deliberation.

CLOSING REMARKS BY MRS. TAI YU-LIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE COORDINATING COMMITTEE, AT THE CLOSING SESSION ON 6 MARCH 1969.

Distinguished Members, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are about to come to the closing of another important Coordinating Committee Meeting. Many fundamental issues have been examined and discussed at this meeting. Agreements and recommendations have been arrived at by the Committee in a pleasant working atmosphere pervaded by the spirit of whole-hearted cooperation and a full sense of responsibility to our region as a whole and a firm determination to make RELC a living example of regional endeavour. With courage, resolute, vision and joint determined effort, we should be able to overcome any temporary obstacle. The agenda for this meeting has been lengthy, but we have completed the task that was expected of us.

Before we leave this Conference Hall, I would like to express most sincerely, on behalf of the Committee, my gratitude and thanks to the Department of Education, Philippines for hosting this meeting. To H.E. Dr. Onofre D. Corpus, the Secretary of Education, we are indeed grateful for his warm hospitality, the personal interest and strong support he has given to this meeting and to the RELC from the very beginning. We thank the Department of Education for the excellent facilities extended. We shall all leave the Philippines with happy memories of a land that is beautiful and a people that is friendliness itself. We also thank the Hon. Juan L. Manuel, Director of Public Schools and concurrently acting Under-Secretary of Education for his inspiring opening address for the meeting.

On behalf of the Committee I would like to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to our good friend and colleague Mr. Jose Enriques for all the assistance and time given in ensuring the success of this meeting. I also express to him my profound thanks for the support and cooperation he has given me in his capacity as Vice-Chairman. We are greatly indebted to him and his hard-working, concientious and dedicated organising committee for the excellent work done in the administration of this regional meeting. I wish to extend my sincere thanks to our Rapporteur and the efficient local Secretariat for preparing the draft report which we have approved and which we shall soon submit to our Ministers of Education. The local Secretariat, with Professor Aurora Samonte and Miss Fe Manza themselves serving on the editorial staff, has rendered us the most efficient service and facilitated smooth progress of our discussions.

We also deeply appreciate the assistance given to us at this meeting by the SEAMES representative, Mr. Thavisakdi Srimuang, Dr. Robert Jacobs and Dr. Robert Krug.

Finally, I wish everyone a very pleasant journey home and look forward to the next time we meet. I now declare this meeting closed.

TIME-TABLE

Tuesday, 4 March

9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Opening Ceremony Opening Address by Hon. Juan L. Manuel Director of Public Schools and concurrently Acting Under-Secretary of Education Manila Address by Mr. Thavisakdi Srimuang SEAMES Representative Bangkok
9:30 - 10:00 a.m.	Refreshments
10:00 - 12:00 noon	Plenary Session I
12:00 - 2:00 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Plenary Session II
(3:15 - 3:30 p.m. - Coffee break)	

Wednesday, 5 March

8:30 - 12:00 noon	Plenary Session III
(10:00 - 10:15 a.m. - Coffee break)	
12:00 - 2:00 p.m.	Lunch
2:00 - 5:30 p.m.	Plenary Session IV
(3:15 - 3:30 p.m. - Coffee break)	

Thursday, 6 March		
	3:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Presentation and adoption of report
		Communique
		Closing
	5:00 p.m.	Refreshments
Friday, 7 March		Departure for home

Annexe 5

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

I. Coordinating Committee Members

Indonesia	Dr. Samsuri, Dean, School for Language and Art Teachers, Institute of Education, Malang.
Laos	Madame Pinkham Simmalavong, Director of Studies, English Section, College of Education, Vientiane.
Malaysia	Mr. Yap Hong Kuan (Rapporteur), Chief Organiser (Secondary Schools), Ministry of Education, Federal House, Kuala Lumpur.
Philippines	Mr. Jose T. Enriquez (Vice-Chairman), Assistant Director, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila, Philippines.
Singapore	Mrs. Tai Yu-lin (Chairman), Assistant Director of Education, Ministry of Education, Singapore.
Thailand	Mrs. Mayuri Sukwiwat, Director, English Language program, University Development Commission, Bangkok.

II. Officials from SEAMES, Bangkok

Mr. Srimuang Thavisakdi,
Senior Staff Member.

III. Consultants

(i) Dr. Robert Jacobs,
Regional Education Adviser,
Bangkok, Thailand.

(ii) Dr. Robert E. Krug,
Associate Director,
Asia/Pacific Office,
American Institutes for Research,
Bangkok, Thailand.

IV. Observers

Mr. Tran Dinh Hy,
Embassy of Vietnam.

(See list of other observers on p.138)

V. Regional English Language Centre Staff

(i) Mr. J.H. Faulhaber,
Development Officer,

(ii) Dr. D.P. Horst,
TEP Research Supervisor and
Specialist in Research Design.

(iii) Mr. N. de Souza,
Registrar and Bursar.

VI. Secretariat

(i) Dr. Rosalina M. Goulet,
College of Education,
University of the Philippines.

(ii) Mrs. Annie R. Menez,
College of Education,
University of the Philippines.

(iii) Miss Cleofe C. Mendinueto,
Supervisor of English,
Division of City Schools,
Quezon City.

(iv) Mr. Luis Santos,
Head, Department of English,
A. Bonifacio High School,
Caloocan City.

VII. Editors

(i) Professor A. L. Samonte,
Associate Professor,
College of Education,
University of the Philippines,
Diliman,
Quezon City.

(ii) Miss Fe Manza,
Chief, Elementary English Section,
Bureau of Public Schools,
Manila.

INVITED OBSERVERS

4 MARCH

Morning Session

10:30 - 12:00 p.m.

1. Dr. Alfredo T. Morales
2. Mr. Maximo Ramos
3. Dr. Bonifacio P. Sibayan
4. Dr. Josephine B. Serrano
5. Dr. Irene Wakeham
6. Dr. Elmer Ordones
7. Mrs. Laura S. Oloroso
8. Miss Adelaida Paterno
9. Miss Leticia Arbis

Afternoon Session

2:00 - 5:30 p.m.

1. Miss Luz B. Cabanos
2. Mrs. Balbina N. Codilla
3. Mrs. Minda C. Sutaria
4. Dr. William Gardner
5. Mrs. Lilia Juele
6. Mrs. Aurora Santos
7. Miss Esperanza Gonzales

5 MARCH

8:30 - 12:00 p.m.

1. Dr. Nelia G. Gasambre
2. Dr. Fe Otanes
3. Mrs. Petronila Goseco
4. Miss Beatrice Low
5. Miss Maria Sernal
6. Mrs. Remedios M. Cayarl
7. Mrs. Dolores T. Dungo

2:00 - 5:30 p.m.

1. Miss Rosita Gallega
2. Miss Elita de la Cueva
3. Mrs. Paciencia Remolona
4. Mr. Florendo Lucas
5. Mrs. Fe A. Yap
6. Mrs. Atanacia Dorado
7. Mrs. Commemoracion Concepcion

6 MARCH

3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

1. Dr. Alfredo T. Morales
2. Dr. Bonifacio P. Sibayan
3. Atty. Pompeyo Gregorio
4. Dr. Emy Pascasio
5. Mrs. Desideria Rex
6. Father Teodoro Liamzon

ORGANISING COMMITTEE

1.	Chairman	Mr. Jose T. Enriquez, Assistant Director, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila,
2.	Vice-Chairman	Dr. Felixberto C. Sta. Maria, Dean, College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
3.	Member	Prof. Aurora L. Samonte, College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
4.	Member	Miss Fe Manza, Chief, Elementary English Section, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila.
5.	Member	Mr. Gaudencio N. Cajator, Education Executive Assistant, Bureau of Vocational Education, Manila.
6.	Secretary	Mrs. Filipinas L. Enriquez, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila,
7.	Member, i/c Airport Reception and Entertainment	Mrs. Emma F. Bernabe, Supervisor of English, Division of City Schools, Quezon City.

8.	Member	Miss Carolina Rionda, College of Eduation, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
9.	Member	Mrs. Elena C. Cutiongco, Elementary School Head Teacher, Division of Rizal.
10.	Member	Mrs. Inez Q. David, Supervisor of English, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila.
11.	Member, i/c of Refreshments	Mrs. Eufrocina D. Lavengco, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila,
12.	Member, i/c of Publicity	Mr. Orlando S. Benoza, Curriculum Coordinator, Bureau of Public Schools, Manila.

COMMUNIQUE

The Fifth Meeting of the Coordinating Committee for the Regional English Language Centre (RELC) of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council was held at the Rajah Humabon Hall of Sulo Hotel, Quezon City, Philippines, on 4-6 March 1969. The meeting was attended by Committee members from Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Mr. Srimuang Thavisakdi, addressed the meeting on behalf of the Director of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat (SEAMES) and represented the SEAMES Director at the meeting. Also present were two consultants from USAID, Bangkok and the American Institutes for Research, three staff members of the Regional English Language Centre, as well as observers from the Bureau of Public Schools, Bureau of Vocational Education, the University of the Philippines and other educational institutions in the Greater Manila area.

The meeting was formally opened by Mr. Juan L. Manuel, Director of Public Schools and concurrently Acting Under-Secretary of Education, Philippines, in a simple but impressive ceremony attended by several distinguished guests, among them His Excellency the British Ambassador, other members of the diplomatic corps, and representatives from the Ford Foundation, the Philippine-American Educational Foundation, USAID, and leading educators and English language teaching specialists. Mr. Tran Dinh Hy represented the Vietnam Embassy in the last day of the meeting.

In the five plenary sessions of the meeting, the Committee worked out measures to provide for the smooth operation of the various programs of the Centre with special emphasis on the training and research programs, finalised plans for the forthcoming Regional Seminar on New Developments in the Theory and Methods of Teaching and Learning English, suggested revisions on the draft of the RELC Constitution, and made policy decisions relating to the publication of the RELC professional journal.

It was decided that the next meeting of the Committee will be held at Bangkok some time in October, 1969.